

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS, FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING

Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation, Development, and Dismissal

This document sets forth the Department of Economics, Finance and Accounting's policies, criteria, and processes for faculty evaluation (merit), development (tenure and promotion), and dismissal. These guidelines are subordinate to the parameters of University guidelines, as included in the latest version of the Fort Hays State University Faculty and Staff Handbook (Faculty Handbook) and the latest version of the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between Fort Hays State University and the FHSU Chapter of the American Association of University Professors (FHSU-AAUP).

The policies, criteria, and processes for faculty development and evaluation should:

- Satisfy the requirements of all applicable accrediting bodies for the Department of Economics, Finance and Accounting, provided said requirements are not in conflict with the Faculty and Staff Handbook or MOA.
- Be equitable in application, and implemented with the input of faculty within the Department of Economics, Finance and Accounting.
- Be congruent with the mission of the College of Business and Entrepreneurship.
- Be transparent.
- Be as measurable and as objective as possible.
- Include faculty assistance, development, and support procedures to address any lack of performance.

VALUES STATEMENT

Providing quality instruction is the primary mission of the Department of Economics, Finance and Accounting; instructors strive to promote the academic and personal growth of students and to prepare students for positions of responsibility in a competitive business environment by fostering stimulating, interactive learning that stresses student involvement, business professionalism, and academic excellence. Teaching effectiveness is a major criterion for merit, retention and tenure, as well as promotion to any rank.

The Department of Economics, Finance and Accounting emphasize quality instruction, as well as intellectual contribution and service. A wide range of intellectual contributions that reflects the expertise of the faculty is seen as complementary to and supportive of the primary goal of providing quality education to students. Thus, research on instruction and issues related to instructional development, as well as applied and theoretical research, are important. Making intellectual contributions enables faculty to expand the domain of business knowledge, contribute to improvements in professional practice, and enhance instructional effectiveness.

The service role of faculty is comprised of University, public, and professional activities. University service allows faculty the opportunity and responsibility of participating in the decision-making processes of the university, college or department. Involvement in professional service reflects the commitment of faculty to their profession. Involvement in public or community service stems from the traditional view of the role of the University in the

dissemination of new information. Community service is defined as the application of a faculty member's formally recognized area of expertise within the community, typically without pay or with token payment. Service performance at Fort Hays State University includes service to the faculty member's profession, service to Fort Hays State University, and service to the community.

ANNUAL MERIT EVALUATION

The annual merit evaluation of each faculty member will be based on instructional activity, intellectual contributions, and service and will be consistent with the Faculty Handbook and the MOA.

The annual merit evaluation of each faculty member will be based on instructional activity, intellectual contributions, and service activities. In order to compete for annual merit monies that might be available, a faculty must first meet the minimum requirements for each area: instructional activity, intellectual contributions, and service activities. Failure to meet the minimum requirement in any one area will result in a zero "merit" salary increase for the year. This does not apply to salary increases negotiated by AAUP that are not designated as "merit" allocation.

Minimum Faculty Performance Requirements

I. Instructional Activity

The minimum performance requirements for Instructional Activity include: Meet the instructional expectations identified on the Faculty Annual Statement of Responsibilities including addressing any identified instructional issues/problems.

II. Intellectual Contributions

The minimum performance requirement for Intellectual Contributions is for the faculty member to have published two (2) publications in the faculty member's academic discipline and/or area of instructional expertise, within the most recent five-year period. These intellectual contributions are recognized as those that exist in public written form (either electronic or hardcopy) and are subject to scrutiny by academic peers or practitioners prior to publication. In addition, EFA recognizes multiple-colleague intellectual contributions equally, subject to a maximum of four authors for a given publication.

Exceptions to this minimum performance requirement include: 1. Faculty in the ABD stage of their doctoral program for a period of 3 years from the date of achieving ABD status; 2. Faculty who are within 5 years of receiving their doctoral degree or completing the AACSB Bridge Program certification in their teaching discipline. Faculty in the second category are expected to show annual progress in their research program as outlined in their Annual Statement of Responsibilities. 3. Faculty who have one Tier 1 publication within the five-year period (subject to approval by the college's research committee). 4. Faculty who are classified as professionally qualified who will have their expectations outlined in the Annual Statement of Responsibilities

III. Service

The minimum requirements for service is that a faculty member utilizes their skills associated with their academic qualifications in their discipline to serve the department, college, university, profession, or community. Minimum service expectations will be specified in the Annual Statement of Responsibilities.

MERIT POINTS

Faculty who have met minimum performance requirements in all areas of teaching, intellectual contributions, and service may acquire merit points as specified in sections below. There is no upper limit on the number of total points that can be counted in any of the three areas. Merit points by faculty will be determined as a percent of total merit points across all faculty in the department who are eligible for merit consideration.

Teaching

- Student evaluation rating (average of selected questions) – 10 points maximum

4.8 or higher	10
4.6	9
4.4	8
4.2	7
4.0	6
3.8	5
3.6	4
3.4	3
3.2	2
3.0	1

- Engage in professional development (includes: participation in workshops, seminars, trainings sessions pertaining to one's field, to education generally, or to the use of technology in the classroom) – 1 point per clock hour up to 10 points, then 1 point per 2 hours thereafter
- Use of written assignments – 2 per class, limit of 10
- Use of extra instructional activities – 2 per class, limit of 10
- Use of projects and/or service learning assignments – 2 per class, limit of 10
- Use of teamwork – 1 per class, limit of 5
- Development of a new course – 4
- Redevelopment of a course – 2
- Receipt of honors or awards and recognition for instructional activities – 5
- Supervising internships, apprenticeships – 2

- Supervising research or thesis coursework – 5
- Receipt of honors or awards and recognition for advising activities – 5
- Other – variable

Research

- Publish peer reviewed journal article – 25 points per year for 2 years
- Publish book or textbook – 25 points per year for 2 years
- Publish instructional materials – 10
- Publish non-peer reviewed article – 5
- Edit book or volume – 5
- Publish chapter or article in edited volume – 10
- Submit new article to peer reviewed journal – 5
- Present paper or working paper at academic or professional conference – 5
- Present abstract at academic or professional conference – 2
- Obtain grant funding – 3
- Obtain professional certification – 20
- Perform major editorial responsibilities – 10
- Receipt of honors or awards and recognition for research activities – 5
- Other – variable

Service

- Counsel or mentor students (includes undergraduate research experience) – 3
- Serve as faculty advisor of student organization – 5
- Chair a university, college or departmental committee – 6
- Serve on a university, college or departmental committee – 3
- Attend SRP – 2
- Chair a professional organization – 6
- Serve as an officer or director of a professional organization – 3
- Serve as a member of community board or committee – 3
- Participate in recruitment events – 2
- Receipt of honors or awards and recognition for service activities – 5
- Other – variable

TENURE AND PROMOTION

Tenure

Fort Hays State University shall award tenure on the basis of merit which has been substantiated by academic credentials and by the results of a systematic evaluation of the faculty member involved. Tenure is not automatic but must be earned.

All faculty members being considered for tenure have the obligation to demonstrate they are qualified to serve the University on a continuing basis in teaching, scholarly responsibilities, and service. Accordingly, such faculty members must provide the evaluating body with appropriate evidence of how they have discharged their responsibilities. Faculty should refer to the Memorandum of Agreement with AAUP and the University Faculty and Staff Handbook concerning the tenure, pathway, procedure and tenure file format.

Eligibility for Tenure is conditional upon a faculty member fulfilling all the requirements set forth as to degree requirements, professional expectations, and probationary period.

Degree requirement for academic qualification requires a combination of original academic preparation (degree completion) augmented by subsequent activities that maintain or establish preparation for current instructional responsibilities. The following descriptions are meant to be indicative, not exhaustive, of the meaning of academic qualification.

(1) A research doctoral degree in the area in which the individual instructs.

The term “research doctoral degree” relates to completion of a degree program intended to produce scholars capable of creating original scholarly contributions through advances in research or theory. Since the intent of academic qualifications is to assure that a faculty member has research competence in the primary field of instruction, the existence of a current research record in the instructional field will be accepted as prima facie evidence of academic qualifications.

(2) A doctoral degree in a business field but primary instructional responsibility is in another business field.

Normally, a person meeting this condition will be considered to be academically qualified if he/she maintains active involvement in the areas of instructional responsibility through writing, participation in professional meetings, or related activities. Someone with a doctoral degree in an area related to the field in which he/she teaches is translating his/her expertise in ways relevant to business. Since many business theories and practices derive from related business fields, such a business doctorate can be an important faculty resource. The greater the disparity between the field of academic preparation and the area of instruction, the greater the need for supplemental preparation in the form of professional development.

(3) A doctoral degree outside of business, but primary instructional responsibilities that incorporate the area of academic preparation.

Someone with a doctoral degree in an area related to the field in which he/she instructs is translating his/her expertise in ways relevant to business. Since many business theories and practices derive from basic disciplines outside of business, such an individual can be an important faculty resource. Normally, a faculty member meeting this condition will be considered academically qualified, provided he/she maintains active involvement in the areas of instructional responsibility as outlined above. The greater the disparity between the field of academic preparation and the area of instruction, the greater the need for supplemental preparation in the form of professional development.

(4) A doctoral degree outside of business and primary instructional responsibilities that do not incorporate the area of academic preparation.

Those meeting this condition would not be considered academically qualified without additional preparation. To be considered academically qualified, an individual meeting this condition must have completed additional coursework or personal study sufficient to provide a base for participation in the mix of instruction, intellectual contribution, and service sought by the school. The AACSB Bridge Program is an example of sufficient additional academic preparation. The burden of justification in these cases rests with the faculty member to validate.

Professional Expectations of granting tenure shall embrace excellence in the areas of instruction, intellectual contributions, and service to the university, the region, and profession.

Instruction is of primary importance to the academic mission of the EFA, COBE, and the University. Effective instruction must be demonstratively evident and offered as such by the candidate for tenure.

The faculty member must meet minimum performance standards set out in the Merit section of this document each year in the tenure review. The faculty member is expected to have completed his or her doctorate degree and have acceptable intellectual contributions that show a progressing research agenda. The faculty member's service record is expected to meet the minimum expectations shown on the annual statement of responsibilities.

Probationary Period

(1) In accordance with the tenure process set out in the MOA, systematic evaluations are conducted each year to determine if faculty members will be reappointed to the tenure-track position. The decision to award tenure shall be made during the sixth year of service. In cases where tenure is denied, the seventh year of service is the terminal year of appointment.

(2) Tenure is not granted for a temporary or part-time position.

Promotion

Promotion in rank is not a matter of routine, seniority, or time served. Rather, it is the recognition of the cumulative professional record of a faculty member, as well as his/her potential for continued growth and contribution. The criteria to be used for evaluating faculty

members for promotion are presented below. Faculty should refer to the Memorandum of Agreement with AAUP and the University Faculty and Staff Handbook concerning the promotion procedure and promotion file format.

Assistant Professor. Although promotion shall not be granted solely on the basis of time in rank, achievement of a terminal degree is necessary before an instructor becomes eligible for promotion to assistant professor. Upon receipt of the terminal degree, an instructor **will become** eligible to be promoted to the rank of assistant professor.

Associate Professor. Although promotion shall not be granted solely on the basis of time in rank, five years of service as an assistant professor is regarded as the normal time necessary before an assistant professor becomes eligible for promotion to associate professor. An early promotion will be considered only when there is acceptable evidence of truly exceptional contributions in teaching, scholarly activities, and university/professional service. A terminal degree deemed appropriate by the discipline is required for promotion from assistant to associate professor.

Evaluation for promotion to the rank of associate professor shall emphasize a sustained commitment to excellence in instruction. In addition, the candidate shall clearly have achieved a level of intellectual contributions which have been recognized by professional peers. In the rank of assistant professor, as part of the scholarly portfolio, a minimum of two acceptable peer-reviewed journal articles plus other evidence of scholarly activity related to the discipline will be expected for promotion if the faculty has a terminal degree in the teaching discipline. Additionally, the faculty member must be instructionally current. The faculty member shall have become a visible member of the academic community through involvement in university and professional service, and shall demonstrate a commitment to continued professional growth.

Professor. Although promotion shall not be granted solely on the basis of time in rank, five years of service as an associate professor is regarded as the normal time necessary before an associate professor becomes eligible for promotion to professor. An early promotion will be considered only when there is evidence of exceptional contributions in instruction, intellectual contributions, and university/professional service.

In addition to maintaining excellence in his/her instructional activities, the candidate shall also have provided leadership in creating an intellectual environment. The candidate shall be an accomplished scholar in his/her discipline and shall have achieved mastery of relevant skills. Also, the cumulative record of intellectual contributions shall be substantially greater than that expected of other ranks. Accomplishments shall be recognized by professional peers both from within and outside the University. For promotion, a faculty member will be expected to publish, as part of his/her scholarly portfolio, a minimum of three acceptable peer-reviewed journal articles plus other evidence of scholarly activity related to his/her instructional discipline since the last promotion. An applicant for promotion to the rank of professor must demonstrate research mastery in his/her discipline (e.g., at least one acceptable solo research publication). Additionally, the faculty member must be instructionally current. Furthermore, there shall also be an established record of significant contributions in the form of university and professional service.

PROCEDURES RELATING TO DISMISSAL OF TENURED FACULTY DUE TO CHRONIC LOW PERFORMANCE

The Department of Economics, Finance and Accounting is committed to recruiting only those faculty who show clear promise of success in the academic setting. The department is committed to the principles of academic freedom and, within those principles, to the system of tenure. Tenure is an important part of academic freedom, but does not accord freedom from accountability. Just as the department is committed to recruit excellent faculty and to insure the excellence of their performance, so too is the department dedicated to faculty renewal and development. Thus the concept of regular, rigorous faculty review is a part of the department's commitment to providing support to all faculty.

The EFA faculty recognizes that the relationship between a faculty member and the department requires adequate performance of certain duties by the faculty member. Tenure, in its protection of academic freedom, while it shields faculty from discriminatory, unfair, arbitrary or capricious dismissal, is not designed to shield them from the consequences of inadequate performance or non-performance of their duties.

Every faculty member's performance is subject to review to determine whether each faculty member has fulfilled his or her duties. Sustained failure of a faculty member to carry out his or her academic responsibilities, despite the opportunities for faculty development or other appropriate interventions, is cause for consideration of dismissal from Fort Hays State University by due process. All pertinent procedures in the MOA and Faculty Handbook must be followed.

Evaluation/Dismissal Process

The individual's performance expectations for the period are determined by the allocation of effort and the departmentally-established responsibilities in an academic area. These expectations will serve as the basis for the individual's annual reviews—as outlined in the annual evaluation process.

The faculty member will provide relevant information for the purposes of evaluation. Multiple sources of information used to evaluate the teaching component will include students' ratings of instruction and other information such as course subject content, course administration, prior annual statements of responsibility.

The annual evaluation document used by the EFA department will include a statement of the overall acceptable level of performance that meets faculty academic responsibilities, a provision for faculty development, and a statement of a faculty member's right to due process, including use of grievance procedures set out in the MOA, in the event any disagreement should arise in the course of the evaluation. In conjunction with a plan of action for the annual statement of responsibilities, the chair will provide written notice of weaknesses identified in the faculty member's performance.

The faculty member must understand that a sustained overall failure to meet departmental expectations is a basis for dismissal. The faculty member may request a review by a faculty committee designated to hear such matters in the department. The review committee, if used,

will issue a non-binding recommendation (which goes into the faculty member's personnel file) on the appropriateness of this conclusion to the department chair.

If the annual evaluation reveals that a faculty member's performance is below departmental minimal performance expectations in teaching, intellectual contributions, or service, the written evaluation shall be specific in describing the deficiencies and in suggesting methods for improvement. The faculty member will be warned with this evaluation that failure to address the identified deficiencies or meet minimum performance requirements will result in the designation of "Chronic Low Performer" at the next annual evaluation.

During any given year, numerous events or activities may negatively impact a faculty member's performance in one area. For example, (a) a heavy teaching load may severely limit the time available for scholarly activity; (b) new courses, the number of courses or course preparations, the nature of course material, rapidly changing course content, and the nature and level of work required of students may negatively affect students' course evaluations; (c) revision of papers submitted for publication or presentation may be extensive and time consuming and may severely limit the time available for other professional areas; or (d) administrative assignment and/or a heavy service assignment may severely limit a faculty member's time available for scholarly activity. These factors will be considered in making such decisions.

The department chair, after meeting with the Dean of the college, will consult with the individual about development and/or improvement activities and will also indicate in writing a suggested course of action to improve the performance of the faculty member. The suggested course of action may include appropriate provisions for faculty development, or for other appropriate interventions, such as counseling, medical leave or a change in teaching assignments. Changes in the distribution of effort will be documented in the faculty member's personnel file.

If a faculty member is designated as a chronic low performer, the department chair and review committee (if used) will state the nature of the failure to meet the departmental expectations, the faculty member will be allowed two years after being officially designated as a chronic low performer to rectify the deficiencies specified. If the faculty member fails to rectify the situation in those two years, the faculty member will be dismissed.

Recommended and approved by the faculty of the Department of Economics, Finance and Accounting on December 5, 2013.

Approved by the dean of the College of Business and Entrepreneurship on December 11, 2013.

Approved by the provost of Fort Hays State University.

This document replaces all the existing pertinent departmental documents on faculty evaluation, development, and dismissal.

FORT HAYS STATE UNIVERSITY
College of Business and Entrepreneurship
Department of Informatics Policies
for Faculty Evaluation
11.10.14

This document prescribes the Department of Informatics (INF) policies, criteria, and processes for faculty development and evaluation for merit, tenure, and promotion. These align with the parameters of the University policies included in the Fort Hays State University Faculty and Staff Handbook and the Memorandum of Agreement with Fort Hays State University Chapter of the AAUP. They are intended to comply with accreditation standards when relevant.

The policies, criteria, and processes for faculty development and evaluation must be:

- Congruent with the mission of the Department of Informatics and the mission of each major offered within the department;
- Congruent with the mission of the College of Business and Entrepreneurship;
- Equitable, fairly applied, and implemented with the input of faculty;
- satisfy the requirements of relevant certification and accreditation organizations as applicable;
- Transparent;
- Measurable and as objective as possible;
- Congruent with and integrated into FHSU's overall faculty evaluation system; and Include faculty assistance, development, and support procedures to continually improve and support teaching, scholarship, and service.

VALUES STATEMENT

Providing quality instruction is a primary goal of the College of Business and Entrepreneurship. Instructors strive to promote the academic and personal growth of students and to prepare students for positions of responsibility in competitive business and professional environments by fostering stimulating, interactive learning that stresses student involvement, professionalism, and academic excellence.

Faculty instructional effectiveness is a major criterion for merit, retention and tenure, as well as promotion to any rank. Effective instruction requires up-to-date subject matter expertise, pedagogy skills, and engagement with students. It requires a commitment to student learning and achievement and the desire and ability to communicate effectively with students in the classroom, interpersonally, and through various forms of electronic media. Frequent, prompt feedback is provided on student performance. Quality instruction may require coordination and cooperation with other faculty teaching the same course to develop course objectives and to assure uniform coverage of material, coordination with colleagues to assure that course objectives fit within a framework of a major, concentration, or certificate, or to cooperate with colleagues to undertake assurance of learning or other assessment activities vital to the department, college, or university.

The College of Business and Entrepreneurship's emphasis on quality instruction is recognized and supported in its research and professional service functions. A wide range of intellectual contributions that reflect the expertise of the faculty are seen as complementary to and supportive of the primary goal of providing quality education to students. Thus, research on teaching and issues related to instructional development, as well as applied and theoretical research, are important. Scholarly and creative activities enable faculty to expand the domain of business, media, technology, and public policy knowledge; contribute to improvements in professional practice; and enhance teaching effectiveness.

The service role of faculty is comprised of university, profession, and public activities. University service allows faculty the opportunity and responsibility of participating in the leadership and decision-making processes of the university at the department, college, and university levels. Involvement in professional service reflects the commitment of faculty to their profession and specific discipline. Involvement in public or community service stems from the traditional view of the role of the University in the dissemination of new information and source of expertise and specialized leadership. Community service is defined as the application of a faculty member's formally recognized area of expertise in the community, region, state or even nationally, typically without pay or with token payment.

CONTRIBUTIONS AND ACHIEVEMENTS TO BE CONSIDERED

1. Evidence to be used in evaluating a faculty member's **teaching performance** includes: (1) self-evaluations; (2) student evaluations and feedback; (3) grade distributions and work load reports. Evaluation is comparative and departmental, General Education, or university averages and distributions may be relevant; (4) other documentation directly relating to classroom performance ranging from awards and recognitions, to cooperation in using common syllabi and alignment with published course objectives to unexcused cancellation of classes may be considered. Colleague observations are relevant in considering tenure or promotion. Chair observations may be relevant for considering annual evaluation, tenure, and promotion.
2. Evidence to be used in evaluating a faculty member's **scholarly achievements** include peer reviewed publications and other intellectual contributions. Scholarly achievements recognized shall be in the faculty member's academic discipline and/or related to his or her area of teaching expertise. Other intellectual contributions may vary by the faculty member's role and discipline. Forms included in this policy, or in the Digital Measures portfolio software will provide greater specificity in defining "Other intellectual contributions."
3. Evidence to be used in evaluating a faculty member's **service** includes: (1) service to the university, (2) service to the faculty member's discipline. (3) service to the external community related to the faculty member's area of expertise.

For faculty evaluation purposes, the College of Business and Entrepreneurship establishes 60/20/20 weights for instruction/intellectual contributions/service contributions respectively,

unless otherwise negotiated with the department chair and approved by the dean in the faculty member's Annual Statement of Responsibilities (ASR).

Faculty Qualifications and Intellectual Contributions

To enhance and maintain quality education in the accomplishment of the school's mission, the COBE faculty must acquire and sustain their intellectual qualifications and current expertise. To assure that faculty members remain qualified, the college has developed this faculty evaluation and development process to evaluate individual faculty member's contributions to the respective major, department, and college's mission.

Faculty qualifications or extensive professional experience and subsequent activities that maintain or establish preparation for current teaching responsibilities. To maintain currency and relevance in their disciplines, all faculty members must be engaged in scholarly or creative activities. While faculty qualifications are sustained by a variety of activities such as intellectual contributions, professional development, consulting and/or other types of professional experiences, a substantial cross-section of the faculty in each discipline should produce intellectual contributions that advance the knowledge and practice of their respective area. (See the *College of Business and Entrepreneurship Guidelines for Faculty Qualifications* for more specific information.)

For purposes of evaluation and development, intellectual contributions at the College of Business and Entrepreneurship are recognized as scholarly productions that exist in public form and were subject to scrutiny by academic peers or practitioners prior to publication and which are generally available either through university libraries and databases or the Internet.) The mission of the College of Business and Entrepreneurship emphasizes teaching, indicating that intellectual contributions in the area of instructional development will be as desirable and supportive of the COBE's goals as service-related, applied, and discipline-based research. Certain fundamental tenants of academic citizenship apply in all types of faculty evaluation in the college. Collegiality, honesty, execution of contractual responsibilities, and compliance with university policies, Board of Regents Policies, and local, state and federal laws are expected.

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

The evaluation of each faculty member will be based on instruction, scholarly activities and service as defined below, and will be consistent with the Fort Hays State University Faculty Handbook and the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between Fort Hays State University Chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and Fort Hays State University, if applicable.

Materials to be submitted by a faculty member for annual evaluation include:

- A self-evaluation of instruction, scholarship, and service that analyzes performance of the faculty member in accord with the individual's previous Annual Statement of Responsibilities and on-going Faculty Development Plan. These self-evaluations will be submitted to the department chair according to an annual schedule established in the MOA.

- Student evaluations of teaching, course enrollment and grade distribution reports will be provided to the faculty member and to the departmental chair and will be used in annual evaluation. Chair observations of classes may also be relevant. This data for the annual review will be for the previous calendar year.

The departmental chair will review the self-evaluation, student evaluations, the faculty member's previous year's Annual Statement of Responsibilities, and Faculty Development Plan. The chair will evaluate the faculty member using these materials and may consider such factors as the chair's observation of instruction, the faculty member's alignment of instruction with course objectives, and the faculty member's fulfillment of his or her annual statement or responsibilities.

The chair will provide written feedback, and will meet individually with the faculty member to discuss the annual evaluation. At the time of the annual evaluation meeting, the chair and faculty member will initiate the development of an Annual Statement of Responsibilities for the upcoming academic year. These responsibilities may be amended during the year based on changing departmental needs or opportunities.

Instructional Activity

Faculty instructional activity is evaluated primarily based on the quality and substance of instruction. The load and composition of a faculty member's class enrollments may also be factors for consideration. Faculty members teaching General Education classes, core classes, or classes with heavy quantitative or research requirements often receive lower student evaluations than faculty members teaching upper division elective courses. Advising is one of the activities that FHSU considers to be part of instruction. In providing a self-evaluation, a faculty member should briefly comment upon and support the following:

- Courses taught and any notable information about student preparation or engagement, grade distributions, or complexity of the courses
- Efforts at continual improvement and innovation in instruction and advising
- Challenge of the courses taught. Courses should align with Bloom's Taxonomy with higher level courses moving up the taxonomy, moving from knowledge to comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation
- Use of instructional activities such as substantial writing, simulations, cases, problems, projects, and presentations designed to develop analytical thinking and other critical skills
- Efforts at connecting with students and supporting student academic and professional development and career goals
- Alignment of course content with degree learning objectives (e.g. BBA learning objectives)
- Alignment of instructional activities with mission enhancing activities such as NSSE, Writing Across the Curriculum, Service Learning, or direction of student research projects/ joint research with students
- Student evaluations and comments in the courses taught

- Any special awards, recognitions, or other evidence of instructional excellence (teaching and advising)

Each faculty member will rate him or herself on a ten point Likert Scale [An electronic version of the Self Evaluation Form is available on Digital Measures]. Typically, a self or chair rating of the "High Merit," will be unusual and will reflect unusual accomplishments. The basis for such a rating must be documented in the Comments section. Successful instruction and continued efforts at instructional improvement are factors that will lead to a self or chair evaluation in the middle to high on the instructional scale. A self or chair evaluation of "No Merit" will reflect abandonment of classes, a lack of preparedness, indifferent or ineffective interactions with students, or a lack of competence in the subject matter. Failure to provide instruction aligned with course objectives, ineffective instructional communication, unorganized materials, incomplete coverage of course materials, failure to hold scheduled class sessions, failure to respond to student communications, failure to update course materials, failure to return student assignments or tests in a timely manner, failure to provide feedback, lack of rigor in grading, and multiple course evaluations substantially below program or department averages are factors for a faculty member to be evaluated as low performing in instruction. A faculty member receiving "No Merit" or low merit may be cause for his or her performance to be defined as "low performance in instruction" for consideration of Chronic Low Performance.

Teaching Activities Negotiated Weight _____%
 (High Merit) _____ (No Merit)

Comments:

Scholarly Activity

University Scholarly Activity Definition: The *Fort Hays State University Faculty Handbook* defines Scholarly Activity as follows:

Scholarly activity shall be understood to include, but not be limited to, publication (printed or electronic) of textbooks, monographs, software, and articles in professional journals; presentations at scholarly meetings, including participation as moderator or responder; exhibitions or awards for creative works, recitals, and performances; novels, short stories, or review; research and creative activities supporting the above; and the development or application of technology to one's given field.

The College of Business and Entrepreneurship recognizes four areas of scholarly activity. These are Discipline Based Scholarship, Learning Based Scholarship, Contributions to Practice, and Scholarship of Engagement. These are defined as:

Discipline-based scholarship contributions add to the theory or knowledge base of the faculty member's field. Published research results and theoretical innovation qualify as discipline-

based scholarship contributions. Examples include refereed presentations at academic conferences and seminars, refereed articles in academic journals, refereed books, monographs, and chapters, major editorial responsibilities such as editor-in-chief or executive editor of academic journals, reports from sponsored research, and so on.

Learning and pedagogical research contributions influence the teaching-learning activities of the school. Preparation of new materials for use in courses, creation of teaching aids, and research on pedagogy all qualify as learning and pedagogical research contributions. Examples include refereed articles on teaching innovations, textbooks and chapters, presentations to education seminars or conventions, teaching cases, major editorial responsibilities such as editor-in-chief or executive editor of pedagogical or learning-focused journals, new learning materials, new curricula development, new course creation, and so on.

Contributions to practice influence professional practice in the faculty member's field. Articles in practice-oriented journals, creation and delivery of executive education courses, development of discipline-based practice tools, and published reports on applied consulting all qualify as contributions to practice. Examples include refereed articles in practitioner journals, presentations at practitioner seminars or conventions, reports from sponsored research on practice issues, documented practice software, media creation, patents, executive education course creation, major editorial responsibilities such as editor-in-chief or executive editor of practitioner journals, earning recognized industry certifications, participation in industry related continuing education, and so on.

Scholarship of engagement, as defined by the National Review Board, captures scholarship in the areas of teaching, research, and/or service by engaging faculty in academically relevant work that simultaneously meets university and college missions and goals as well as community needs. In essence, it is a scholarly agenda that integrates community issues. In this definition, community is broadly defined to include audiences external to the campus that are part of a collaborative process to contribute to the public good. The scholarship of engagement involves connecting the resources of the university to the most pressing social, civic, economic, and ethical problems facing students, communities, and society by generating research and teaching that supplies civic purpose and public meaning to the production of knowledge. The scholarship of engagement encompasses not only the quality and impact of public service work, but also the dissemination of public service as expressed through intellectual contributions and interaction among academic scholars.

Peer review will mean that an activity is subject to evaluation, critique, and perhaps challenge by peers. Generally, these peers will be within the academic discipline or profession. Because of the critical interactions between academia and industry in this field, the assessment of professionals is important as well as is the assessment of academics. Peer review may in limited circumstances be from within the university or department. In measuring significance, substantially greater weight in the departmental quantitative guidelines will be given to reviews external to the institution because of the importance of exposing ideas, methodologies, works, performances, competencies, and other scholarly activities to outside evaluation. The department has developed a scholarship point system to document scholarly accomplishments.

The highest points are allocated to those contributions combining the greatest time commitment with the most rigorous evaluation by academic peers and/or practitioners.

Points should be counted upon conclusion of an activity e.g. publication of submitted article, award of grant, approval of supervised thesis. Works in progress may be reported, but will not be given credit until concluded.

Faculty Earning Professional Certifications

The Department of Informatics recognizes relevant professional certifications as scholarly activities. Such certifications are developed through an interaction of academia and industry. Reputable certifications are criterion referenced with expert review teams establishing such criteria in a form of peer review. Frequently, certifications require not only testing, but also presentation and demonstration in order to display advanced mastery of a technology. For example, the Cisco Certified Academy Instructor - Networking Curriculum (CCAI-N) requires satisfactory performance of a threaded case study with an acknowledged master. The Cisco Certified Internetworking Expert (CCIE) certification requires a two day laboratory examination (after a series of testing) in which a person with expert knowledge designs a set of complex networks with assigned limitations and equipment involving obscure protocols and interoperability issues. The CCIE applicant creates this network within time limitations in a testing laboratory. The network is then sabotaged by the reviewing panel and the examinee has a limited period of time to troubleshoot the network and restore its functionality.

Certifications do not so much reflect an industry skepticism of traditional academic degrees, but instead reflect an industry and academic desire to differentiate professionals who have pursued and mastered advanced knowledge in focused subject matters. Certifications also reflect a currency of understanding, while a degree is static. An initial certification in a subject area may minimally require 140 clock hours of preparation and an advanced one may require hundreds of hours. Preparation typically includes not only study and secondary research, but also laboratory experimentation and demonstration culminating in examination. Like a research study in an Informatics study area, such a certification will quickly age and become obsolete, requiring future replacement certifications. Each significant change in information technologies will require new certifications and new depths of knowledge from faculty.

General Policies

Faculty members in the department are encouraged to participate in types of scholarly activity that fit their professional goals and the mission of their academic discipline and are not expected to participate in all types of scholarly activity, but to be active scholars and to have an active scholarship agenda.

The Department of Informatics does not mandate that scholarly activity be either sole or participatory. Both are encouraged. The weighing system below is not intended to be all inclusive. A faculty member may submit, substantiate, and justify other forms of scholarship which will be weighed by the departmental faculty.

Points cannot be double-counted for the same intellectual contribution. For example, a paper should not be presented at multiple conferences without substantial revisions. Shared authorship is accepted; however, all recognized authors must have made meaningful contributions to a scholarly product.

All faculty members will aim to earn at least 5 scholarship points per year. Failure to earn at least 5 scholarship points in per year may be cause for his or her performance to be defined as “low performance in scholarship” for consideration of Chronic Low Performance. First year appointments, emergency overloads, health emergencies, and administrative assignments are among reasons for waiving this requirement; however, faculty members must maintain relevant qualifications regardless of short-term emergencies.

When a faculty member disagrees with an evaluating party on the scholarly point allocations the faculty member earned for scholarly activity, he or she may present an appeal in writing to the College of Business and Entrepreneurship Research Committee for arbitration. The evaluating party may provide a written explanation of its understanding of the policy and respective scholarly activity. The Research Committee will then pass on its recommendation to the Dean for final approval. The faculty member will be able to pursue the appeal procedure for merit set forth in the Faculty Handbook, or the MOA if applicable, and nothing contained herein is intended to limit or alter those procedures.

The point system is intended as a guideline for differentiating among various intellectual contributions. The underlying premise for point allocation is the extent to which contributions improve theory and practice, and support the present and future quality of instruction at this and other institutions.

Intellectual Contributions	Point Guideline
Peer Reviewed Journal Article	15
Published Book - sole author on subject matter relevant to faculty teaching responsibility published in academic or commercial (non-vanity) press	20
Published Book - shared authorship __% of book x 20	
Published Book Chapter	5
Major editorial responsibilities for scholarly journal - e.g. Editor in Chief	8
Associate editorial responsibilities for scholarly journal	6
Other Intellectual Contributions	
1. Research, Scholarly and Creative Contributions	
Refereed Case Study	10
Research Monograph	10
Edited Book	10
Paper in Conference Proceedings	10

*Published Teacher's Manual/Workbook/Test Bank/Study Guide	5
*Published Software Program	10
Grant of patent relevant to discipline - sole researcher or developer	10
Grant of patent - relevant to discipline - shared research of development - % x 10	
Production and national distribution of a full length movie or documentary	15
Movie or documentary - shared production % x 15	
Production of a nationally distributed media program	12
Production of a regionally distributed full length or short film (i.e. film festival)	8
Production of regionally distributed media program	7
Production of news piece distributed nationally	7
Production of news piece distributed on a regional multi-state basis	4
Production of news piece distributed locally	1
Published Compilations in author's discipline	2
*Published Book Review	5
2. Presentations	
Presentation at Academic Conference	5
Active presenter in on-campus faculty research activity such as a scholarly presentation to a departmental faculty colloquium or college research luncheon.	2
Panel participant or moderator at an academic or professional conference or workshop	2

Validating Experiences including, but not limited to	Point Guideline
Funded national grant proposal for research activities, equipment, or faculty development	7
Funded regional grant proposal for research activities, equipment, or faculty development	3
Funded local grant proposal for research activities, equipment, or faculty development	1
Non-funded, but submitted and rejected external grant proposal. This scholarly activity is only to be considered in annual evaluation and may not be counted toward tenure.	1
Published second or higher edition of textbook	5

Consulting through university organization (MDC, IEI, Docking SBDC) (8-hour day x .5). A maximum of 10 points earned in consulting may be applied toward tenure.	10
Consulting directly with client (8 hour day x .25). A maximum of 10 points earned in consulting may be applied toward tenure.	10
Actively pursuing a Ph.D. program – maintaining part-time status during the academic year. This scholarly activity is only to be considered in annual evaluation and may not be counted toward tenure.	10
Supervising a scholarly or creative student project submitted to a professional or academic competition recognized by the departmental faculty. (Maximum of 2 pts per year)	2
Obtaining a new professional certification (Certification must be approved, recognized by profession and approved by departmental faculty).	5
Testimony on subject matter of expertise written by faculty member before a legislative or administrative body at the state level (points pro-rated by % of authorship)	4
Testimony on subject matter relevant to faculty member's instruction written by faculty member and submitted before a federal legislative or administrative body (points pro-rated by % or authorship)	8
Attendance of a scholarly or professional conference or workshop without presenting	2
Participation in a webinar or other similar digital scholarly activity	1
Creating/delivering successful executive education seminar	7
*Maintaining an active consulting practice with multiple clients	2
Writing a popular press book on teaching subject matter with national distribution	10
Authoring widely distributed reports	5
*Publishing a newsletter, sequence of reports, or professional website	5
Operating a business	2
Top three award in professional contest approved by departmental faculty	2
Honorable mention entry of work in professional content approved by departmental faculty	1
Published product feature or tutorial on subject matter related to faculty member's area of instruction (maximum of 5 pts per year)	1

* Verifiable documentation of impact must be provided. The type of documentation is left at the discretion of the faculty member, but must clearly demonstrate their contribution was meaningful, valuable, and positive.

Faculty Member Bibliography and Summary for Evaluated Year

In providing an annual summary of scholarly activity, each faculty member will update all publications, presentations, and scholarly activities in appropriate fields in Digital Measures. These entries will allow the faculty member and others to create bibliographies for specified periods of times such as for the last year or last five years. They will also be used to automatically populate accreditation tables and reports.

Annual Scholarly Self Evaluation

Each faculty member will rate him or herself on a nine point Likert Scale. Typically, a self or chair rating of Highest Merit, will be unusual and will reflect unusual accomplishments such as the publication of a book or multiple academic articles and several other contributions. A self or chair evaluation of No Merit will reflect few to no scholarly activities and a lack of an established scholarly agenda. For annual evaluation, each year's accomplishments stand alone.

Scholarly Activities

Negotiated Weight ____

(High Merit) | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | (No Merit)

(All scholarly activities must be entered into Digital Measures to be recognized)

Service Activity

The service role of faculty is comprised of University, public, and professional activities. University service allows faculty the opportunity and responsibility of participating in the decision-making processes of the University and helping to execute important work vital to the operations of the department, college, and college. Involvement in professional service reflects the commitment of faculty to their profession. Involvement in public or community service stems from the traditional view of the role of the University in the dissemination of new information. Community service is defined as the application of a faculty member's formally recognized area of expertise in the community, typically without pay or with token payment. The following describes service performance at Fort Hays State University.

1. Service to the profession includes but is not limited to state, regional, or national offices held in professional organizations, organizing a professional workshop or meeting, and other related activities.
2. Service to FHSU includes but is not limited to committee assignments (chair or member), offices held (elective or appointed), involvement in campus activities (Parent's Day, high school workshops, etc.), part-time administrative assignments, sponsoring or advising a student organization, contributions to recruitment or retention of students and

so on. This service includes activities in support of the program area, department, the college, and the University.

3. Community service as a part of the evaluation process should be related to one's expertise.

Substantial and meaningful service is expected of every faculty member in the College of Business and Entrepreneurship over the course of his or her career. Service expectations will vary by rank and responsibilities. Meaningful service is required for tenure. Tenured faculty are expected to maintain an active role in the service and leadership of the academic community within the college. Even temporary full-time faculty are typically expected to have appropriate service responsibilities and are viewed as participating members of the campus community. Failure to perform service activities as identified in a faculty member's Annual Statements of Responsibility may be cause for a his or her performance to be defined as "low performance in service" for consideration of Chronic Low Performance.

In the College of Business and Entrepreneurship, service performance is measured by a faculty member's service to the profession, department, college, university and community. Activities requiring substantial time commitments and responsibilities are weighed more heavily than activities requiring only a brief time commitment and lighter responsibilities. The faculty member carries the burden of proof to demonstrate the commitment to and active participation in service activities. Demonstration of participation may include, but is not limited to: descriptions of accomplishments, letters of support from committee chairs and reports or other documentation of committee or organizational productivity. To meet the spirit of these expectations for meritorious service, the faculty member must address the following question: What did she/he actually do within the committee/organization to help meet the committee's/organization's goals?

All faculty in the college are expected to annually take an active service role in the recruitment and enrollment of new students – unless specifically excluded in the faculty member's Annual Statement of Responsibilities. Recruitment roles deserving highest recognition include visiting high schools and community colleges, attending out-of-town Student Recognition Programs and career fairs, and creating recruitment materials. Other activities that are important include participating in visitation days, representing the department or college at on-campus career events, participating in pre-enrollments, and meeting with potential students.

Student organizations are recognized as providing important contributions to the quality of the learning environment in the College of Business and Entrepreneurship. Student activities are also valuable in both recruiting new students and helping current students find jobs. Active leadership of student organizations is recognized as an important service contribution.

Service to the profession through scholarly review activities, service as editors, assistant or associate editors of journals, conference organizers, and board members or officers of professional organizations is supported and encouraged by the College of Business and Entrepreneurship.

Each faculty member will rate him or herself on a ten point Likert Scale. Typically, a self or chair rating of Highest Merit, will be unusual and will reflect unusual accomplishments such as serving as Faculty Senate President or president of a disciplinary national organization in a faculty member's discipline, or chairing multiple campus committees coupled with other responsibilities. A self or chair evaluation of No Merit will reflect few to no service activities. Faculty who are members of committees, but do not attend or do not participate in or carry out assignments may also earn No Merit or low merit ratings.

NOTE: Simply 'serving' as a 'dues-paying member' of a professional or community service organization does not count toward meritorious service. If a faculty member is as a member of committees which have not met or required responsibility during the evaluation period, these committees may be listed, but should be noted as "Not active during period."

Service Activities

Negotiated Weight

(High Merit) | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | **(No Merit)**

Comments:

Overall Evaluation of Faculty Annual Performance

Each faculty member will rate him or herself on a ten point Likert Scale. Typically, a self or chair rating of Highest Merit, will be unusual and will reflect unusual accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service. Merit should be emphasized based on the negotiated weight; however, a significant deficit in one area must be addressed. A self or chair evaluation of No Merit will reflect significant problems requiring remediation and immediate improvement and potentially ending of offering of temporary contracts, termination from consideration from tenure track, or post-tenure review. The faculty member and chair will summarize their evaluations of the faculty member's accomplishments over the evaluation time period with written comments.

Overall Evaluation of Faculty Annual Performance

(High Merit) | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | **(No Merit)**

Comments:

See FHSU-AAUP Article XIII: Merit Evaluation from the Memorandum of Agreement for the current Fiscal Year.

Approved by the faculty of the Department of Informatics March 01, 2013

Appendix A

College of Business and Entrepreneurship (COBE) Annual Faculty Merit Evaluation Report Form

(See COBE Faculty Development and Evaluation Policy for directions)

(Total length limited to a maximum of four pages)

Name: _____ **Position:** _____

Instructional Activities

Negotiated Weight __%

(High Merit) | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | (No Merit)

Comments:

Scholarly Activities

Negotiated Weight __%

(High Merit) | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | (No Merit)

(All scholarly activities must be entered into Digital Measures to be recognized)

Comments:

Service Activities

Negotiated Weight 10%

(High Merit) | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | (No Merit)

Comments:

Overall Evaluation of Faculty Annual Performance

(High Merit) | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | (No Merit)

Comments:

Appendix B

[Faculty Member Name]

Annual Statement of Faculty Responsibilities
[Title], Department of Informatics

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide a written description of the job expectations for the upcoming academic year. The job responsibilities are based on the weighting of ___ / ___ / ___ for Instruction, Scholarly Activity, and Service during the Fall _____ term and ___ / ___ / ___ for Instruction, Scholarly Activity, and Service during the Spring _____ term.

_____ holds a _____ [temporary, tenure track, or tenured], 9-month appointment in the Department of Informatics.

(1) INSTRUCTION

The instructional component of a faculty unit member's responsibilities may include both traditional and electronic learning environments, classroom and non-classroom teaching activities, and may include, but not be limited to, development of new courses or new instructional materials including software. Academic advising, supervising, mentoring, and consulting with on and off campus students and assessment of teaching and learning activities are generally considered a part of instructional activity.

Fall 20xx

(a) Teach four in-load courses.

Fall courses will include:

Advise undergraduate students and take some responsibility for advising graduate students in the MLS, MPS, or MBA, and those who are earning concentrations in Informatics.

Spring 20xx

(b) Teach four in-load courses during the spring semester.

Spring courses will include:

Advise undergraduate students and take some responsibility for advising graduate students in the MLS, MPS, or MBA, and those who are earning concentrations in Informatics.

(2) SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

Scholarly activities include research, writing, publication and creative activities appropriate to the faculty unit member's discipline or interdisciplinary work in traditional or electronic publications of recognized value to the University and the faculty unit member's discipline. Creative activities may include those identified in the Informatics Department Faculty Development Policy relevant to the faculty member's discipline or interdisciplinary work. Scholarship that _____ plans to be engaged with includes:

(3) SERVICE

There are three general categories of service for faculty unit members: service to Fort Hays State University (department/college/university), the member's profession, and service to the general community.

Service to Fort Hays State University includes, but is not limited to, committee assignments (chair or member), offices held (elective or appointed), involvement in campus activities (Parents' Day, high school workshops, etc.), part-time administrative assignments, sponsoring or advising a student organization, contributions to recruitment or retention of students. This service includes activities in support of the department, the college, and the University.

Service to the profession includes, but is not limited to, state, regional, or national offices held in professional organizations, organizing a professional workshop or meeting, and other related activities.

Community service that is a part of the evaluation process should be related to one's professional expertise. Service activities and accomplishments that _____ expects to complete or be part of during the _____ - _____ 2010 term include:

DEPARTMENTAL AND UNIVERSITY SUPPORT

To assist the faculty member in completing these goals the department and university will (pending funding): (a) provide travel monies, (b) provide research support monies, (c) provide student assistance, and (d) provide computer equipment and office space. The Department will expect that requests for travel funds will meet the timelines of the University Faculty Development Committee. Faculty are also expected to avail themselves of the services and support of the Center for Teaching Excellence and Learning Technologies (CTELT), the Computing and Telecommunications Center (CTC), and other campus resources providing support for instruction, scholarship, and service.

SUMMARY OF EXPECTATIONS

The above are "expectations" which the chair and faculty member have agreed to pursue. It is the committed goal of the faculty member to meet these expectations. It is the committed goal of the department to support the faculty member in his or her efforts to complete these and other instructional, scholarly, and service activities. Additional needs of the faculty member, department, college and university will likely be identified during the academic year and the faculty member may volunteer or may be asked to undertake other assignments and tasks. Some assignments may be dropped due to changes in needs. This document serves as a planning and as a communication tool for the faculty member, department chair, dean, and others in the university community. Any significant changes such as changes in course assignments, made to the Statement of Responsibility during the contract year should be put in writing with signatures, dated, and attached to this document.

Signed:

_____, _____ Professor

Department of Informatics

Date:

_____, Department Chair

Department of Informatics

Date:

Appendix C

Fort Hays State University and College of Business and Entrepreneurship Faculty Development Resources

Fort Hays State University and the College of Business and Entrepreneurship provide a range of support for the continuous development of faculty members as teachers, scholars, and academic servants.

Chair and Colleagues - The university and college offer a collegial atmosphere encouraging faculty development. Department chairs and faculty colleagues are supportive in assisting faculty with teaching, scholarship, and service development. The culture is supportive of formal and informal peer feedback, review of course materials, collaboration on scholarship, and guidance and mentorship of service.

Departmental Assistance - Departments can provide a variety of types of assistance to faculty members including travel, student workers, graduate student assistance, equipment, editing, data acquisition, submission of action plans, etc. Resources must be balanced based on availability, productive uses, and needs.

Center for Teaching Excellence and Learning Technologies (CTELT) - CTELT provides a continuing series of workshops on teaching and use of teaching and course management technologies. It also provides pedagogical expertise to assist with course development, course planning and delivery, assessment design, and interaction with students.

Graduate School - The Graduate School provides workshops on grant writing, identifying grant resources, and compliance with university and federal policies and legal requirements. It also provides individualized assistance in identifying grant sources and in helping write grants and to develop budgets.

Release Time and Sabbatical - Release time and sabbatical policies are contained the *FHSU Faculty Handbook*. Faculty members may be released from one or more classes to focus on scholarly activity or special service activities. Sabbaticals are a tool available to enhance scholarship.

Summer Research Funding - The FHSU Graduate School provides Summer Research Funding to enable faculty to focus on research activities during the summer break.

Graduate School Small Grant Program - The FHSU Graduate School provides small grants for a range of purposes such as the acquisition of data, hiring of student assistants, obtaining specialized equipment, or travel for research purposes.

Faculty Development Funding - Funding resources are available at the department, college, and university levels for faculty development such as participating in conferences and workshops. Support is available to enhance instruction, scholarship, and to a lesser degree service.

TENURE AND PROMOTION

TENURE

The *Fort Hays State University Faculty Handbook*, states in part, “The granting of tenure by the Kansas Board of Regents is a privilege and not a right. Tenure will be granted when the faculty

member has been shown to have the proper qualifications and when it is in the long-term interest of the university.” Fort Hays State University shall award tenure on the basis of merit which has been substantiated by academic credentials and by the results of a systematic evaluation of the faculty member involved.

All faculty members being considered for tenure have the obligation to demonstrate they are qualified to serve the university on a continuing basis in quality teaching, scholarship, and service. Faculty should refer to the Memorandum of Agreement and the University Faculty and Staff Handbook concerning the tenure, pathway, procedure and tenure file format.

Eligibility for Tenure:

To be an eligible candidate for tenure, a faculty member must: possess an appropriate academic degree and have met departmental requirements for tenure encompassing: 1) Instruction, 2) Scholarship; and 3) Service. Collegiality, honesty, execution of contractual responsibilities, and compliance with university policies, Board of Regents Policies, and local, state and federal laws are expected of all candidates and are required conditions to remain on tenure track and for receipt of tenure. The tenure review process should reveal a growing compatibility between the institutional priorities of FHSU and the long-term potential contributions of a candidate.

A. Degree Requirements and Alignment with Academic Position

A faculty member must minimally possess a terminal degree in the field of instruction to be a candidate for tenure. Faculty who teach courses required in the Bachelors of Business Administration and Masters of Business Administration programs and faculty teaching business classes - even if used for other degree programs such as the Bachelors of General Studies or Professional Science Masters are expected to meet minimum scholarship standards relating to accreditation.

A candidate’s teaching, scholarship, and service focus must be compatible with the position he or she has been hired to fill. If a candidate is unwilling or unqualified to instruct classes specified as required in his or her position description at the time of hiring, her or she will be terminated from tenure track.

B. Achievements to Obtain Tenure

To obtain tenure, a faculty member must establish an on-going record of excellence in instruction, significant scholarship, and substantial and meaningful service. A candidate must all of these standards. While instruction is of primary importance, a candidate must also meet the standards of scholarship and service.

Instruction

To establish a record of “instructional excellence” candidates are expected to demonstrate a clear instructional and advising philosophy, intentional approaches to instruction and learning, integrity and rigor in coursework, the ability to communicate effectively with students, alignment

of course content with course objectives, alignment of courses with degree objectives, alignment of course level with Bloom's Taxonomy, participation in relevant assessment and assurance of learning processes, and dedication to continuous innovation and improvement of instruction and advising.

If a candidate is teaching a course or courses that are also taught by other faculty, he or she will demonstrate cooperation in course development and presentation of uniform content coverage to meet the course's learning objectives. Assessment tools may also be coordinated. Exceptions from uniform coverage will be purposeful, coordinated, and assessed. Exceptions may be vital steps for innovation and course improvement.

Alignment of instructional activities with mission enhancing activities such as NSSE, Writing Across the Curriculum, Service Learning, or direction of student research projects/ joint research with students are also relevant indicators of teaching excellence and should be reported.

The type of coursework the candidate instructs will be noted by the candidate. Reviewers will expect lower grade distributions for freshmen and sophomore level classes and core classes than upper division electives. Grade distributions are expected to be comparable with those of other faculty in the discipline. Candidates will avoid grade inflation and will typically have relatively statistically normal grade distributions appropriate to the class level.

Candidates will illustrate their successes as instructors and advisors in connecting with students and supporting student academic and professional development and career goals.

Scholarship

To establish a record of significant scholarship, a candidate member must earn a minimum of 25 scholarly points as established in the department's Annual Merit Evaluation Policy to be tenured. Such points will have been earned during the candidate's candidacy period including time periods of service credited toward tenure.

Service

To become tenured, a candidate's service must be substantial and meaningful. In the College of Business and Entrepreneurship, service performance is measured by a faculty member's service to the profession, department, college, university and community. Activities requiring substantial time commitments or responsibilities are weighed more heavily than activities requiring only a brief time commitment or lighter responsibilities. The faculty member carries the burden of proof to demonstrate the commitment to and active participation in service activities. Service should be on-going and should have been reported in the candidate's Annual Faculty Merit Evaluation Report Form.

C. Probationary Period

1. Candidates shall serve a probationary period of six years of full-time employment unless a candidate can demonstrate unusual accomplishments warranting earlier consideration. Normally,

this period will consist of six regular annual academic year appointments at the rank of assistant professor or higher, plus reappointment for the seventh year. In accordance with the tenure process set out in the MOA, systematic evaluations are conducted each year to determine if faculty members will be re-appointed to the tenure-track position. The decision to award tenure shall be made during the sixth year of service. In cases where tenure is denied, the seventh year of service is the terminal year of appointment.

2. Tenure is not granted for a temporary or part-time position.

3. Faculty coming to Fort Hays State University with prior service at other institutions at ranks earning tenure at FHSU may have some or all of these years of service count toward the probationary period. For persons employed in the rank of assistant professor, no more than three years of prior service at another institution may count toward the probationary period. For persons employed at the rank of associate professor, no more than four years of service may be counted. For persons employed at the rank of professor, no more than five years of service may be counted. Exceptions must be approved by the president. Instructional excellence, scholarship and service work will be evaluated over the accepted periods of prior service and the time spent on probationary tenure track at FHSU.

PROMOTION

Promotion in rank is not a matter of routine, seniority, or time served. Rather, it is the recognition of the cumulative professional record of a faculty member as well as his or her potential for continued growth and contribution. The criteria to be used for evaluating faculty members for promotion are presented below. Faculty should refer to the Memorandum of Agreement with AAUP and the University Faculty and Staff Handbook concerning the promotion procedure and promotion file format.

It is the policy of the College of Business and Entrepreneurship to hire tenure track faculty with terminal degrees at the rank of assistant professor or higher, depending on credentials. To be eligible for appointment to the rank of "Assistant Professor," "Associate Professor," or "Professor," a faculty member must hold a terminal degree in his or her area of instruction.

Assistant Professor

Although promotion shall not be granted solely on the basis of time in rank, achievement of a terminal degree is necessary before an instructor becomes eligible for promotion to assistant professor.

Associate Professor

Although promotion shall not be granted solely on the basis of time in rank, five years of service as an assistant professor is regarded as the normal time necessary before an assistant professor becomes eligible to apply for promotion to associate professor. Early promotions will be considered only when there is acceptable evidence of truly exceptional contributions in teaching,

scholarly activities, and service. A terminal degree deemed appropriate by the discipline is required for promotion from assistant to associate professor.

Evaluation for promotion to the rank of associate professor shall emphasize a sustained commitment to excellence in teaching. In addition, the candidate shall clearly have achieved a level of scholarship indicated by mastery of relevant disciplines and skills as well as having made significant scholarly contributions which have been recognized by professional peers. In the rank of assistant professor, as part of their scholarly portfolio, a minimum of two acceptable peer-reviewed journal articles plus other evidence of scholarly activity related to the discipline will be expected for promotion. Total scholarly points will exceed 50 points.

The faculty member shall have become a visible member of the academic community through involvement in university and professional service, and shall demonstrate a commitment to continued professional growth. To be promoted to associate professor, a candidate's service must be substantial and meaningful.

Professor

Although promotion shall not be granted solely on the basis of time in rank, five years of service as an associate professor is regarded as the normal time necessary before an associate professor becomes eligible for promotion to professor. Early promotions will be considered only when there is evidence of exceptional contributions in teaching, scholarly achievement, and service.

In addition to maintaining excellence in teaching, the candidate shall also have provided leadership in creating an intellectual environment. The candidate shall be an accomplished scholar in his or her discipline and shall have achieved mastery of relevant skills. Also, the cumulative record of scholarly productivity shall be substantially greater than that expected of other ranks. Accomplishments shall be recognized by professional peers both from within and outside the University.

To be promoted to the rank of professor, the faculty member must have a sustained record of teaching excellence during the time period since last promotion. Not only will candidates for professor have generally been in the top half of teaching evaluations in their discipline, they will have distinguished themselves in instructional leadership activities such as course or program development, assessment, instructional innovation, mentorship of other instructors, maintaining appropriate grade distributions and in maintaining standards of quality in the discipline, department, and/or college. A successful candidate will likely have evidence of recognition of instructional excellence from students, alumni, peers, and/or professional organizations.

For promotion, faculty members will be expected to publish, as part of their scholarly portfolio assembled since their last promotion, publications and other scholarly activities worth a total of at least 100 scholarly points related to the candidate's teaching discipline. Applicants for promotion to the rank of professor must demonstrate research mastery in their discipline (e.g., at least one acceptable solo research publication) in the time period since the last promotion.

The faculty member shall have become a visible member of the academic community through involvement in university and professional service, and shall demonstrate a commitment to continued professional growth. To be promoted to professor, a candidate's service must be substantial and meaningful and will have evidence of the candidate serving in significant leadership roles.

Approved by the faculty of the Department of Informatics March 01, 2013

PROCEDURES RELATING TO DISMISSAL OF TENURED FACULTY DUE TO CHRONIC LOW PERFORMANCE

Fort Hays State University is committed to recruiting only that faculty who show clear promise of success in the academic setting. The University is committed to the principles of academic freedom and, within those principles, to the system of tenure. Tenure is an important part of academic freedom, but does not accord freedom from accountability. Just as the University is committed to recruit excellent faculty and to insure the excellence of their performance, so too, is the University dedicated to faculty renewal and development. Thus the concept of regular, rigorous faculty review is a part of the University's commitment to providing support to its entire faculty. Therefore we resolve the following based on the statement provided in Article XX: Chronic Low Performance of the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between FHSU-AAUP and FHSU which reads:

1. Continued failure of a tenured faculty member to perform the faculty member's professional duties as defined in department evaluation criteria and / or failure of the faculty member to accept and implement opportunities for improvement of the deficiencies will constitute evidence of "chronic low performance" and warrant consideration of "dismissal for cause" under University policies.
2. Each department and / or program will develop, with faculty input, a set of guidelines describing the minimum acceptable level of productivity for all applicable areas of faculty responsibility as well as procedures to handle alleged cases of chronic low performance as defined by the criteria. It is also clearly understood that faculty renewal, development, and improvement are personal responsibilities of good academic citizenship and are of critical importance to the University in its pursuit of excellence.

I. Statement of Policy

The faculty of Fort Hays State University hereby recognizes that the relationship between a faculty member and the University requires adequate performance of certain duties by the faculty member. Tenure, in its protection of academic freedom, while it shields faculty from discriminatory, unfair, arbitrary or capricious dismissal, is not designed to shield them from the consequences of inadequate performance or non-performance of their duties.

Every faculty member's performance is subject to review to determine whether each faculty member has fulfilled his or her duties. Sustained failure of a faculty member to carry out his or her academic responsibilities, despite the opportunities for University faculty development or other appropriate interventions, is cause for consideration of dismissal from Fort Hays State University, by due process and following all procedures in the MOA and Faculty Handbook as applicable.

II. Implementation

A. Evaluation Process

The annual evaluation document used by each department will include a statement of the overall acceptable level of performance that meets faculty academic responsibilities, a provision for faculty development, and a statement of a faculty member's right to due process, including use of grievance procedures set out in the MOA, in the event any disagreement should arise in the course of the evaluation.

B. Individual Expectations

Fort Hays State University policy provides for differential allocations for effort among tenured faculty in the areas of their academic responsibilities. The individual's performance expectations for the period are determined by the allocation of effort and the departmentally-established responsibilities in an academic area. These expectations will serve as the basis for the individual's annual reviews-as outlined in the annual evaluation process.

C. Evaluation

Each faculty member shall be evaluated annually by the department chair using the criteria outlined in this document. When a tenured unit faculty member's overall performance falls below the minimum acceptable level, as indicated by the faculty member's annual evaluation, the department Chair shall so indicate on the evaluation form and in writing to the faculty member.

If requested by the faculty member, the departmental/program faculty will be involved in the decision leading to the identification of an individual as falling below a minimally acceptable level.

The faculty member will provide relevant information for the purposes of evaluation. Multiple sources of information used to evaluate the teaching component will include students' ratings of instruction and such other information as may be appropriate.

If the annual evaluation reveals that a faculty member's performance is below departmental expectations, the written evaluation shall be specific in describing the deficiencies and in suggesting methods for improvement. The department chair will also review the assignment of differential effort with the faculty member and they will decide what changes are appropriate

and practical. Changes in the distribution of effort will be documented in the faculty member's personnel file.

D. Appropriate Interventions, Including Faculty Development Options

Faculty development is the term used for the University's investment in its faculty. While primarily relied upon to promote development, it may be utilized for corrective action.

When a tenured faculty member's overall performance falls below the minimum acceptable level, the department chair, after meeting with the Dean of the college, will consult with the individual about development and/or improvement activities and will also indicate in writing a suggested course of action to improve the performance of the faculty member. The suggested course of action may include appropriate provisions for faculty development, or for other appropriate interventions, such as counseling, medical leave or a change in teaching assignments. The department chair may call upon the university administration for assistance in constructing such a plan, including provision for additional resources, where needed. A faculty member may reject any plan recommended to aid performance levels, but the faculty member must understand that a sustained overall failure to meet departmental expectations is a basis for dismissal. In subsequent annual evaluations, the faculty member will be required to report on activities aimed at improving performance and provide a listing of improvement initiatives, efforts and results. The names of faculty members who fail to meet minimum standards for the year following the department chair's suggested course of action will be forwarded to the Dean of the College of Business and Entrepreneurship.

E. Recommendation for Dismissal

If a faculty member has two successive or a total of three evaluations in any five year period in which minimum standards are not met, the "dismissal for cause" will occur subject to the results of any appeal pursued in accordance with the MOA. In making this determination, the department chair and review committee must state the nature of the failure to meet the departmental expectations, the reasons for this failure, the number of years that the faculty member has failed to meet departmental expectations, the level of discernible improvement in the faculty member's performance after being notified of any failure in performance, and the extent to which the faculty member has complied with the terms of any plan developed to improve the faculty member's performance.

The findings of sustained failure must not abuse academic freedom or be used as a cover for discriminatory, unfair, arbitrary, or capricious dismissal.

The "overall acceptable level of performance" as approved by the Department of Informatics pursuant to the MOA is described in the annual evaluation process.

Department of Informatics Policy on Chronic Low Performance

The Department of Informatics' intention is to hire, tenure, and retain quality faculty and to support the on-going development and successes of faculty. The Department of Informatics recognizes that professional and personal emergencies and disruptions can temporarily prevent a faculty member from meeting expectations in one or more functional area. It also recognizes that departmental, college, and university needs may shift mid-year and that Annual Statements of Responsibility should reflect such shifts and exigencies. However, in the normal performance of duties, a faculty member is expected to satisfy department, college, and university policies and his or her Annual Statement of Responsibilities.

Unacceptably low performance in teaching, research, or service may lead to a faculty member's dismissal.

CERTAIN FACTORS ARE EVIDENCE OF UNACCEPTABLE LOW PERFORMANCE

TEACHING

Overall, a faculty member is expected to provide appropriate learning opportunities for students, an environment conducive to learning and intellectual development, and evaluations of students' performance. Faculty members are responsible for establishing and maintaining academic or professional qualifications to ensure currency and relevance in their field. Mitigating or unusual circumstances and conditions that may affect teaching performance should also influence the evaluation of teaching performance and be identified. Failure to prepare for classes, to hold scheduled classes, to update course content, continuing failure to respond to student messages, consistent failure to return graded student work and to provide feedback, to follow course catalog descriptions, to treat students with respect, and/or to meet course objectives are actions evidencing unacceptable teaching performance.

SCHOLARSHIP

Every faculty member is expected to be engaged in scholarly activity. Scholarly activity is evidence of a faculty member's intellectual development and currency of knowledge. Faculty who do not earn a minimum of five scholarly points a year for two consecutive years are presumed to have chronically failed to meet scholarly expectations.

SERVICE

Service to the University, College of Business and Entrepreneurship, department, the region, and profession is expected of each faculty member. Given a faculty member's service assignments, he or she is expected to participate in achieving the goals and objectives pertaining to the service assignments. Failure to provide a service as identified in the faculty member's statement of annual responsibilities will evidence unacceptable service performance. Failure to carry out reasonable service assignments or clearly established service expectations, will also evidence unacceptable service performance.

Mitigating Factors

During any given year, numerous events or activities may negatively impact a faculty member's performance in one area. For example, (a) a heavy teaching load may severely limit the time available for scholarly or service activity; (b) new courses, the number of courses or course preparations, the nature of course material, rapidly changing course content, and the nature and level of work required of students may negatively affect faculty course evaluations; (c) revision of papers submitted for publication or presentation may be extensive and time consuming and may severely limit the time available for other professional areas; or (d) administrative assignment and/or a heavy service assignment may severely limit a faculty member's time available for scholarly activity. These factors will be considered in making such decisions.

Approved by the faculty of the Department of Informatics March 01, 2013

FORT HAYS STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS AND LEADERSHIP
Guidelines for Faculty Development and Evaluation – Management and Marketing

This document prescribes the College of Business and Leadership's policies, criteria, and processes for faculty development and evaluation for merit, tenure, and promotion. These guidelines specify for the College of Business and Leadership the procedures and criteria used for Faculty Development and Evaluation within the parameters of the University guidelines as included in the Fort Hays State University Faculty and Staff Handbook (July 2005) and the Memorandum of Agreement with AAUP.

The policies, criteria, and processes for faculty development and evaluation must:

- be equitable, fairly applied, and implemented with the input of faculty within each department of the College of Business and Leadership.
- be congruent with the mission of the College of Business and Leadership
- satisfy the requirements of AACSB
- be transparent
- be measurable and as objective as possible
- be congruent with and integrated into FHSU's overall faculty evaluation system
- include faculty assistance, development, and support procedures to address lack of performance

VALUES STATEMENT

Providing quality instruction is the primary mission of the College of Business and Leadership; instructors strive to promote the academic and personal growth of students and to prepare students for positions of responsibility in a competitive business environment by fostering stimulating, interactive learning that stresses student involvement, business professionalism, and academic excellence. Teaching effectiveness is a major criterion for merit, retention and tenure, as well as promotion to any rank.

The College of Business and Leadership's emphasis on quality teaching is recognized and supported in its research and professional service functions. A wide range of intellectual contributions that reflects the expertise of the faculty is seen as complementary to and supportive of the primary goal of providing quality education to students. Thus, research on teaching and issues related to instructional development, as well as applied and theoretical research, are important. Scholarship activity enables faculty to expand the domain of business knowledge, contribute to improvements in professional practice, and enhance teaching effectiveness.

The service role of faculty is comprised of University, public, and professional activities. University service allows faculty the opportunity and responsibility of participating in the decision-making processes of the University. Involvement in professional service reflects the commitment of faculty to their profession. Involvement in public or community

service stems from the traditional view of the role of the University in the dissemination of new information. Community service is defined as the application of a faculty member's formally recognized area of expertise in the community, typically without pay or with token payment. Service performance at Fort Hays State University includes service to your profession, service to Fort Hays State University, and service to the community.

CONTRIBUTIONS AND ACHIEVEMENTS TO BE CONSIDERED

In making recommendations relative to faculty evaluation in the College of Business and Leadership, the mission of the COBL is of primary importance.

1. Evidence to be used in evaluating a faculty member's teaching performance (1) self-evaluations; (2) student evaluations; (3) chair evaluations which includes a teaching portfolio (e.g., examinations and other means of measuring student learning, course syllabi, instructional materials, service learning, and other items as appropriate).
2. Evidence to be used in evaluating a faculty member's scholarly achievements includes (1) publications in the faculty member's academic discipline and/or teaching expertise (2) intellectual contributions presented to academic and professional groups, (3) reports of research in progress, (4) activities aimed toward research, training, and public service grants and fellowships, and (5) relevant continuing education.
3. Evidence to be used in evaluating a faculty member's service includes (1) service to the University, (2) service to the community, and (3) service to the profession.

Faculty Qualifications and Intellectual Contributions

To enhance and maintain quality education in the accomplishment of our mission, the COBL faculty must acquire and sustain their intellectual qualifications and current expertise. To assure that faculty members remain qualified, the COBL has developed this faculty evaluation and development process to evaluate individual faculty members' contributions to the school's mission. For example, AACSB standards require that 90% of the total faculty resources must be academically qualified (AQ) and/or professionally qualified (PQ) with an AQ minimum of 50% of total faculty; the expectation, therefore, is that the COBL will have in place a policy designed to fulfill this standard.

Faculty qualifications (AQ and PQ) are functions of both original academic preparation (i.e., doctoral degree) and subsequent activities that maintain or establish preparation for current teaching responsibilities. To maintain currency and relevance in their disciplines, all faculty must be engaged in development activities. While faculty qualifications are sustained by a variety of activities such as intellectual contributions, professional development, consulting and/or other types of professional experiences, a substantial cross-section of the faculty in each discipline should produce intellectual contributions that advance the knowledge and practice of business. For purposes of evaluation and development, intellectual contributions at the College of Business and Leadership are

recognized as scholarly production that exists in public written form and is subject to scrutiny by academic peers or practitioners prior to publication. The mission of the College of Business and Leadership emphasizes teaching, indicating that intellectual contributions in the area of instructional development will be as desirable and supportive of the COBL's goals as service-related, applied, and discipline-based research.

ANNUAL MERIT EVALUATION

The evaluation of each faculty member will be based on teaching, scholarly activities and service as defined below, and will be consistent with the Fort Hays State University Faculty Handbook or the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between Fort Hays State University Chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and Fort Hays State University, if applicable. An annual statement of responsibilities, short-term and long-term plans, vitae, teaching and research portfolios will be used in the evaluation of each faculty member. Each faculty member must receive an annual written evaluation addressing the three areas (instruction, research, and service) identifying strengths and weaknesses as well as recommendations for improvements. For faculty evaluation purposes, the College of Business and Leadership establishes 60/20/20 weights for instruction/intellectual contributions/service contributions respectively, unless otherwise negotiated with the department chair and approved by the dean.

Instructional Activity

Teaching effectiveness refers to the competence of the instructor when interacting with students, and includes mentoring, involvement, supervision of student projects, research, and instructionally related work. The assessment of teaching effectiveness is based on evaluation of teaching methodology, student interaction, course management, and content expertise. Teaching performance at Fort Hays State University includes: course content, complexity, and level; student evaluations; teaching innovations; direction of student research projects; awards, honors, and other teaching recognitions.

In the College of Business and Leadership, teaching performance (60 points total) is measured by the department chair with faculty input. The areas of evaluation are: student evaluations (10 points maximum), teaching portfolio (30 points maximum), professional development related to teaching (5 points maximum), self-evaluation (5 points maximum) and student advising (10 points maximum).

A. **STUDENT EVALUATIONS** (average of all questions – **10 points maximum**)

4 or higher	10
3.8	9
3.6	8
3.4	7
3.2	6
3.0	5
Less than 3	1

B. **FACULTY PORTFOLIO** (to be determined by department chair – **30 points maximum**)

Teaching Activities	Point Guidelines
Writing intensiveness	4
Use of diverse presentation modes	4
Use of new and/or diverse instructional materials	4
Integration of emerging information technology	4
Student activities (e.g., library research, presentations)	4
Extra instructional activities (e.g., labs, help sections, internships)	4
New course development	4
Proper course design (e.g., course syllabus, clear statement of educational objectives and currency of materials)	4
Use of projects and/or service learning assignments	4
Regularly maintained office hours and overall availability to students	4
Honors/awards and recognition for teaching	4
Evaluation of student outcomes & providing timely feedback	4
Regular class attendance	4
Other	4

C. **PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT RELATED TO TEACHING** (each activity will be valued at 5 points or as negotiated with the department chair – **5 points maximum**)

Relevant professional development related to teaching which may include teaching-related conferences, workshops, seminars, continuing education, post-doctoral studies, distance learning/online course training, etc.

D. **SELF-EVALUATION (5 points maximum)**

Assess your teaching on a 5-point scale with 1 indicating consistently low performance and 5 indicating consistently excellent and high quality performance. Your evaluation should include the quality and quantity of your teaching, your knowledge of the profession, your interpersonal and communication skills, your initiative and resourcefulness, your supervisory and organizational skills, your attitude, and your flexibility/adaptability.

E. **STUDENT ADVISING** (to be determined by department chair – **10 points maximum**)

Research Activity

In line with AACSB guidelines, the College of Business and Leadership recognizes three areas of scholarly activity. Discipline-based scholarship contributions add to the theory or knowledge base of the faculty member's field. Published research results and theoretical innovation qualify as discipline-based scholarship contributions. Examples include refereed presentations at academic conferences and seminars, refereed articles in academic journals, refereed books, monographs, and chapters, major editorial responsibilities such as editor-in-chief or executive editor of academic journals, reports from sponsored research, and so on.

Learning and pedagogical research contributions influence the teaching-learning activities of the school. Preparation of new materials for use in courses, creation of teaching aids, and research on pedagogy all qualify as learning and pedagogical research contributions. Examples include refereed articles on teaching innovations, textbooks and chapters, presentations to education seminars or conventions, teaching cases, major editorial responsibilities such as editor-in-chief or executive editor of pedagogical or learning-focused journals, new learning materials, new curricula development, new course creation, and so on.

Contributions to practice influence professional practice in the faculty member's field. Articles in practice-oriented journals, creation and delivery of executive education courses, development of discipline-based practice tools, and published reports on applied research all qualify as contributions to practice. Examples include refereed articles in practitioner journals, presentations at practitioner seminars or conventions, reports from sponsored research on practice issues, documented practice software, executive education course creation, major editorial responsibilities such as editor-in-chief or executive editor of practitioner journals, and so on.

Community-based research contributions include the scholarship of engagement. As defined by the National Review Board, the scholarship of engagement captures scholarship in the areas of teaching, research, and/or service by engaging faculty in academically relevant work that simultaneously meets university and college missions and goals as well as community needs. In essence, it is a scholarly agenda that integrates community issues. In this definition, community is broadly defined to include audiences external to the campus that are part of a collaborative process to contribute to the public good. The scholarship of engagement involves connecting the resources of the university to the most pressing social, civic, economic, and ethical problems facing students, communities, and society by generating research that supplies civic purpose and public meaning to the production of knowledge. The scholarship of engagement encompasses the quality and impact of public service work, and its dissemination through intellectual contributions and interaction among academic scholars.

In general, intellectual contributions are considered more valid and valuable when they are subjected to rigorous public scrutiny. This premise is the basis for the point system to be applied to intellectual contributions developed by faculty. The highest points are

allocated to those contributions with the most rigorous evaluation by academic peers and/or practitioners. For purposes of merit evaluation, acceptable intellectual contributions (i.e., those meeting AACSB standards) published over the most recent five-year period will be counted toward annual faculty member research productivity for each annual evaluation over the following five-year period. Only acceptable intellectual contributions can be carried forward to be counted in subsequent annual evaluations – other types of research activity will only be counted toward the annual evaluation in which they occurred (the value of prior publications for merit purposes for new faculty will be negotiated upon hire). Faculty with at least two acceptable intellectual contributions over the most recent five-year period will automatically be allocated the 20 points designated for research activity for each annual evaluation during the five-year period (see numerical example).

Academically Qualified Faculty Research Evaluation

Using the following intellectual point guidelines, the expected qualifications for an academically qualified faculty member is 20 points with at least two acceptable intellectual contributions (i.e., those meeting AACSB standards), or one acceptable intellectual contribution and at least one approved validating academic experience over the most recent five-year period. Exceptions for maintaining academic qualifications would include faculty who are ABD status, who have acquired a terminal degree in the last five years, and who have a non doctoral degree but have attained academically qualified status by achieving the same level of scholarly output required by other academically qualified faculty. The minimum expectation for all faculty teaching graduate courses is two or more acceptable intellectual contributions (i.e., those meeting AACSB standards) in the most recent five years, regardless of the total number of intellectual points earned. For the purposes of the College of Business and Leadership, an acceptable intellectual contribution will be considered as any journal designated as using the blind outside review process listed as such in a Library of Congress registered publication (e.g., Cabell's, Ulrich's, etc.) and meeting AACSB standards. If disagreement exists as to what constitutes an acceptable (i.e. meets AACSB standards) intellectual contribution, it will be up to the faculty member to provide evidence of acceptability and the decision will be made by the COBL Research Committee. The COBL Research Committee will then pass on its recommendation to the department chair and Dean for final approval. The department chair will begin a developmental plan for faculty members who fall below the required minimum number of acceptable intellectual contributions within the most recent five-year period.

Professionally Qualified Faculty Research Evaluation

Using the following intellectual point guidelines, the expected qualifications for all professionally qualified faculty is 20 points with at least one acceptable intellectual contribution over the past five years or at least one approved validating professional experience. Exceptions for maintaining professional qualifications would include faculty who have retired from business within the last five years and faculty who have relevant doctoral degrees. For purposes of merit evaluation, acceptable intellectual contributions

(i.e., those meeting AACSB standards) published over the most recent five-year period and acceptable validating experiences over the most recent five-year period will be counted toward annual professionally qualified faculty research productivity. Faculty with at least one acceptable intellectual contribution publication over the most recent five-year period and/or at least one acceptable validating experience will automatically be allocated 20-points for research activity. The department chair will begin a developmental plan for professionally qualified faculty members who fall below the required 10-point minimum within the most recent five-year period.

Points cannot be double-counted for the same intellectual contribution. For example, a paper presented at both the regional and national levels would earn points for only one conference.

While it is understood that solo intellectual contributions require more individual effort than joint work, the COBL recognizes multiple-colleague intellectual contributions equally, regardless of the number of authors involved. Faculty researchers receive the same number of points for intellectual contributions whether they are a solo author or a co-author.

When faculty members disagree with the point allocations they have received, they may present their argument in writing to the COBL Research Committee for arbitration. The COBL Research Committee will then pass on its recommendation to the department chair and Dean for final approval. The faculty member will be able to pursue the appeal procedure for merit set forth in the Faculty Handbook, or the MOA if applicable, and nothing contained herein is intended to limit or alter those procedures.

The point system is intended as a guideline for differentiating among various intellectual contributions. The underlying premise for point allocation is the extent to which contributions improve theory and practice, and support the present and future quality of instruction at this and other institutions. Degrees of public scrutiny exist, and greater points should be allocated for contributions receiving wider public scrutiny by academic peers and/or practitioners. For example, instructional material presented to a local business association would receive fewer points (but not zero) than contributions published in widely read journals.

Intellectual Contributions	Point Guideline
Acceptable (i.e., AACSB Approved) Publications	
• Published Journal (using the blind outside peer-review process)	10
• Published Book	10
Other Intellectual Contributions	
1. Published Research/Contributions	
• Published Journal (using other review processes)	8
• Refereed Case	8
• Edited Book	6
• Published Teacher's Manual	4
• Published Workbook	4
• Published Test Bank	4
• Published Study Guide	4
• Published Software Program	4
• Published Compilations in author's discipline	2
• Non-refereed Journal Articles	2
• Non-refereed Case	2
• Published Book Chapter	2
• Edited Conference Proceedings	2
• Published Book Review	2
• Published Examination Question Bank	2
• Letter in Journal	2
• Published Discussant Comments	2
• Locally Published Writing	2
2. Public Presentations	
• Inter/National Conference with Paper in Published Proceedings	6
• Inter/National Conference without Paper in Proceedings	4
• Regional Conference with Paper in Published Proceedings	6
• Regional Conference without Paper in Proceedings	4
• Local Presentation with Paper in Published Proceedings	2
• Local Presentation	2

Validating Experiences for Academic Qualifications (to be discussed with and approved by department chair and dean)	Point Guideline
• Faculty internship	10
• Major editorial responsibilities	10
• Funded grant	10
• Publishing second or higher edition of textbook	10
• Invited publications	10
• Obtaining professional certification	10
Validating Experiences for Professional Qualifications	
• Creating/delivering successful executive education seminars	10
• Maintaining an active consulting practice with multiple clients	10
• Writing an invited article for major practitioner journal	10
• Writing a popular press book with national distribution	10
• Delivering major speeches to business community	10
• Authoring widely distributed reports	10
• Publishing a newsletter or sequence of reports that attracts a substantial subscription base	10
• Operating a business	10
• Obtaining a new professional certification	10
• Board of directors of a for-profit or non-profit business	10

Numerical Example

Faculty Research Activity

- 2001** One Published Journal (using the blind outside peer-review process):
- 10 points
- 2002** One Inter/National Conference with Paper in Published Proceedings:
- 6 points
- One Edited Book:
- 6 points
- 2003** No intellectual contributions:
- 0 points
- 2004** One Published Journal (using the blind outside peer-review process):
- 10 points
- 2005** One Regional Conference with Paper in Published Proceedings:
- 6 points
- 2006** One Published Journal (using the blind outside peer-review process):
- 10 points

Faculty Annual Merit Evaluation

- 2001** Annual Evaluation (of the 20-point maximum research activity total)
10 points total (for published journal in 2001)
- 2002** Annual Evaluation (of the 20-point maximum research activity total)
10 points (for published journal in 2001)
6 points (for conference with proceedings)
6 points (for edited book)
22 points total (20-point maximum allocated)
- 2003** Annual Evaluation (of the 20-point maximum research activity total)
10 points total (for published journal in 2001)
- 2004** Annual Evaluation (of the 20-point maximum research activity total)
10 points (for published journal in 2001)
10 points (for published journal in 2004)
20 points total
- 2005** Annual Evaluation (of the 20-point maximum research activity total)
10 points (for published journal in 2001)
10 points (for published journal in 2004)
6 points (for conference with proceedings)
32 points total (20-point maximum allocated)
- 2006** Annual Evaluation (of the 20-point maximum research activity total)
10 points (for published journal in 2004)
10 points (for published journal in 2006)
20 points total

Service Activity

The service role of faculty is comprised of University, public, and professional activities. University service allows faculty the opportunity and responsibility of participating in the decision-making processes of the University. Involvement in professional service reflects the commitment of faculty to their profession. Involvement in public or community service stems from the traditional view of the role of the University in the dissemination of new information. Community service is defined as the application of a faculty member's formally recognized area of expertise in the community, typically without pay or with token payment. The following describes service performance at Fort Hays State University.

1. Service to the profession includes but is not limited to state, regional, or national offices held in professional organizations, organizing a professional workshop or meeting, and other related activities.

2. Service to FHSU includes but is not limited to committee assignments (chair or member), offices held (elective or appointed), involvement in campus activities (Parent's Day, high school workshops, etc.), part-time administrative assignments, sponsoring or advising a student organization, contributions to recruitment or retention of students and so on. This service includes activities in support of the department, the college, and the University.

3. Community service is expected of every good citizen of the community. Community service as a part of the evaluation process should be related to one's expertise.

At the College of Business and Leadership, service performance (20 points total) is measured by department chair evaluation of a faculty member's service to the profession, department, college, university and community. The faculty member carries the burden of proof to demonstrate the commitment to and active participation in service activities. Demonstration of participation may include, but is not limited to, letters of support from committee chairs and reports or other documentation of committee productivity. To meet the spirit of these expectations for meritorious service, the faculty member must address the following question: What did she/he actually do within the committee/organization to help meet the committee's/organization's goals?

Examples of service activity include, but are not limited to:

A. STUDENT INVOLVEMENT EVIDENCE

Student Involvement Evidence	Point Guidelines
Counseling/Mentoring	4
Faculty Advisor for Student Organization	6

B. DEPARTMENT, COLLEGE, OR UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE SERVICE

Department, College and University Committee Service	Point Guidelines
Serve as member of departmental committee	5
Chair a departmental committee	8
Serve as member of college committee	6
Chair a college committee	10
Serve as member of university committee	8
Chair a university committee	12
Attend an SRP (Scholarship Recognition Program)	3
Attend a community college or recruiting visit	3

C. PROFESSIONAL/COMMUNITY SERVICE

Professional/Community Service	Point Guidelines
Serve as member of a regional professional committee	6
Chair a regional professional committee	12
Serve as member of a national/international professional committee	10
Chair a national/international professional committee	16
Serve as member of community board/committee	6
Chair a community board/committee	10
Volunteer for service organization (e.g. Big Brothers Big Sisters) [20 hours during academic year]	8

NOTE: Simply 'serving' as a 'dues-paying member' of a professional or community service organization does not count toward meritorious service.

Annual Merit

See FHSU-AAUP Article XIII: Merit Evaluation from the Memorandum of Agreement for the current Fiscal Year.

TENURE AND PROMOTION

TENURE

Fort Hays State University shall award tenure on the basis of merit which has been substantiated by academic credentials and by the results of a systematic evaluation of the faculty member involved. Tenure is not automatic but must be earned.

All faculty members being considered for tenure have the obligation to demonstrate they are qualified to serve the University on a continuing basis in teaching, scholarly responsibilities, and service. Accordingly, such faculty members must provide the evaluating body with appropriate evidence of how they have discharged their responsibilities. Faculty should refer to the Memorandum of Agreement with AAUP and the University Faculty and Staff Handbook concerning the tenure, pathway, procedure and tenure file format.

Eligibility for Tenure:

To be eligible for tenure a faculty member shall fulfill all the requirements set forth in sections 1, 2, and 3.

1. Degree Requirement

Professional qualification requires both relevant academic preparation and relevant professional experience. Normally, the academic preparation should consist of a master's degree in a field related to the area of teaching assignment. Normally, the professional experience should be relevant to the faculty member's teaching assignment, significant in duration and level of responsibility, and current at the time of hiring. The burden of justification in these cases rests with faculty members to validate.

Academic qualification requires a combination of original academic preparation (degree completion) augmented by subsequent activities that maintain or establish preparation for current teaching responsibilities. The following descriptions are not meant to be exhaustive, but indicative, of the meaning of academic qualification.

A. A doctoral degree in the area in which the individual teaches.

According to AACSB standards, the term "doctoral degree" means completion of a degree program intended to produce scholars capable of creating original scholarly contributions through advances in research or theory. In some cases, programs with the

word “doctorate” (or equivalent) in the title do not have the aim to produce scholars who make original intellectual contributions. Those would not be deemed to be “doctoral degrees” in the sense required in the accreditation review process. Such non-research “doctorates” might be deemed academically qualified per “F” below. Since the intent of academic qualifications is to assure that faculty members have research competence in their primary field of teaching, the existence of a current research record in the teaching field will be accepted as prima facie evidence of academic qualifications, regardless of credentials. Individuals with a graduate degree in law will be considered academically qualified to teach business law and legal environment of business.

B. A doctoral degree in a business field, but primary teaching responsibility in a business field that is not the area of academic preparation.

Normally, persons meeting this condition will be considered to be academically qualified, if they maintain active involvement in the areas of teaching responsibility through writing, participation in professional meetings, or related activities. Those with doctoral degrees in areas related to the field in which they teach are translating their expertise in ways relevant to business. Since many business theories and practices derive from related business fields, these business doctorates can be important faculty resources. The greater the disparity between the field of academic preparation and the area of teaching, the greater the need for supplemental preparation in the form of professional development.

C. A doctoral degree outside of business, but primary teaching responsibilities that incorporate the area of academic preparation.

Those with doctoral degrees in areas related to the field in which they teach are translating their expertise in ways relevant to business. Since many business theories and practices derive from basic disciplines outside of business, these individuals can be important faculty resources. Normally, faculty meeting this condition will be considered academically qualified, provided they maintain active involvement in areas of teaching responsibility as outlined above. The greater the disparity between the field of academic preparation and the area of teaching, the greater the need for supplemental preparation in the form of professional development.

D. A doctoral degree outside of business and primary teaching responsibilities that do not incorporate the area of academic preparation.

Those meeting this condition would not be considered academically qualified without additional preparation. To be considered academically qualified, an individual meeting this condition must have completed additional coursework or personal study sufficient to provide a base for participation in the mix of teaching, intellectual contribution, and service sought by the school. The burden of justification in these cases rests with faculty members to validate.

E. A specialized graduate degree in taxation.

Individuals with a graduate degree in taxation or a combination of graduate degrees in law and accounting will be considered academically qualified to teach taxation.

F. Substantial specialized coursework in the field of primary teaching responsibilities, but no research doctoral degree.

Individuals meeting this condition may constitute specialized instructional resources for the school. Such a faculty member may have a specialized master's degree in a business-related field and have completed some coursework in a business doctoral program, or currently may be a student in a business doctoral program. As noted in category one above, non-research "doctorates" may fit into this category. These individuals are to be considered academically qualified. Except for graduate business students in a research doctoral program who have completed all but the dissertation in their program of study, their number should be limited in each discipline. For such graduate students, this status will apply for no more than three years beyond their most recently completed graduate comprehensive examination.

2. Professional Expectations

Expectations of granting of tenure shall embrace excellence in the areas of teaching, scholarly activity, and service to the university, the region, and profession. Teaching is of primary importance to the academic mission of the College of Business and Leadership and the University. Effective teaching must be demonstratively evident and offered as such by the candidate for tenure. Faculty members must hold the terminal degree and be academically or professionally qualified. Service must be demonstratively evident and offered as such by the candidate for tenure.

An Academically Qualified faculty member must present at least two acceptable intellectual contributions (i.e., those meeting AACSB standards), or one acceptable intellectual contribution and at least one approved validating experience.

A Professionally Qualified faculty member must present at least one acceptable intellectual contribution or at least one approved validating professional experience.

3. Probationary Period

- a. All faculty shall serve a probationary period of six years of full-time employment. Normally, this period will consist of six regular annual academic year appointments at the rank of assistant professor or higher, plus reappointment for the seventh year. In accordance with the tenure process set out in the MOA, systematic evaluations are conducted each year to determine if faculty members will be re-appointed to the tenure-track position. The decision to award tenure shall be made during the sixth year of service. In cases where tenure is denied, the seventh year of service is the terminal year of appointment.

- b. Tenure is not granted for a temporary or part-time position.
- c. Faculty coming to Fort Hays State University with prior service at other institutions at ranks earning tenure at FHSU may have some or all of these years of service count toward the probationary period. For persons employed in the rank of assistant professor, no more than three years of prior service at another institution may count toward the probationary period. For persons employed at the rank of associate professor, no more than four years of service may be counted. For persons employed at the rank of professor, no more than five years of service may be counted. Exceptions must be approved by the president.

PROMOTION

Promotion in rank is not a matter of routine, seniority, or time served. Rather, it is the recognition of the cumulative professional record of a faculty member as well as his/her potential for continued growth and contribution. The criteria to be used for evaluating faculty members for promotion are presented below. Faculty should refer to the Memorandum of Agreement with AAUP and the University Faculty and Staff Handbook concerning the promotion procedure and promotion file format.

It is the policy of the College of Business and Leadership to hire faculty with terminal degrees at the rank of assistant professor or higher, depending on credentials.

Assistant Professor

Although promotion shall not be granted solely on the basis of time in rank, achievement of a terminal degree is necessary before an instructor becomes eligible for promotion to assistant professor. Upon receipt of the terminal degree, instructors will automatically be promoted to the rank of assistant professor.

Associate Professor

Although promotion shall not be granted solely on the basis of time in rank, five years of service as an assistant professor is regarded as the normal time necessary before an assistant professor becomes eligible for promotion to associate professor. Early promotions will be considered only when there is acceptable evidence of truly exceptional contributions in teaching, scholarly activities, and university/professional service. A terminal degree deemed appropriate by the discipline is required for promotion from assistant to associate professor.

Evaluation for promotion to the rank of associate professor shall emphasize a sustained commitment to excellence in teaching. In addition, the candidate shall clearly have achieved a level of scholarship indicated by mastery of relevant disciplines and skills as well as having made significant scholarly contributions which have been recognized by professional peers. In the rank of assistant professor, as part of their scholarly portfolio, a minimum of two acceptable peer-reviewed journal articles plus other evidence of

scholarly activity related to the discipline will be expected for promotion if the faculty has a terminal degree in the teaching discipline. Additionally, the faculty member must be instructionally current. The faculty member shall have become a visible member of the academic community through involvement in university and professional service, and shall demonstrate a commitment to continued professional growth.

Professor

Although promotion shall not be granted solely on the basis of time in rank, five years of service as an associate professor is regarded as the normal time necessary before an associate professor becomes eligible for promotion to professor. Early promotions will be considered only when there is evidence of exceptional contributions in teaching, scholarly achievement, and university/professional service.

In addition to maintaining excellence in his/her teaching, the candidate shall also have provided leadership in creating an intellectual environment. The candidate shall be an accomplished scholar in his/her discipline and shall have achieved mastery of relevant skills. Also, the cumulative record of scholarly productivity shall be substantially greater than that expected of other ranks. Accomplishments shall be recognized by professional peers both from within and outside the University. For promotion, faculty members will be expected to publish, as part of their scholarly portfolio, a minimum of three acceptable peer-reviewed journal articles plus other evidence of scholarly activity related to their teaching discipline since the last promotion. Furthermore, there shall also be an established record of significant contributions in the form of university and professional service.

PROCEDURES RELATING TO DISMISSAL OF TENURED FACULTY DUE TO CHRONIC LOW PERFORMANCE

Fort Hays State University is committed to recruiting only those faculty who show clear promise of success in the academic setting. The University is committed to the principles of academic freedom and, within those principles, to the system of tenure. Tenure is an important part of academic freedom, but does not accord freedom from accountability. Just as the University is committed to recruit excellent faculty and to insure the excellence of their performance, so too, is the University dedicated to faculty renewal and development. Thus the concept of regular, rigorous faculty review is a part of the University's commitment to providing support to all its faculty. Therefore we resolve the following based on the statement provided in Article XX: Chronic Low Performance of the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between FHSU-AAUP and FHSU which reads:

1. Continued failure of a tenured faculty member to perform the faculty member's professional duties as defined in department evaluation criteria and / or failure of the faculty member to accept and implement opportunities for improvement of the deficiencies will constitute evidence of "chronic low performance" and warrant consideration of "dismissal for cause" under University policies.

2. Each department and / or program will develop, with faculty input, a set of guidelines describing the minimum acceptable level of productivity for all applicable areas of faculty responsibility as well as procedures to handle alleged cases of chronic low performance as defined by the criteria. It is also clearly understood that faculty renewal, development, and improvement are personal responsibilities of good academic citizenship and are of critical importance to the University in its pursuit of excellence..

I. Statement of Policy

The faculty of Fort Hays State University hereby recognizes that the relationship between a faculty member and the University requires adequate performance of certain duties by the faculty member. Tenure, in its protection of academic freedom, while it shields faculty from discriminatory, unfair, arbitrary or capricious dismissal, is not designed to shield them from the consequences of inadequate performance or non-performance of their duties.

Every faculty member's performance is subject to review to determine whether each faculty member has fulfilled his or her duties. Sustained failure of a faculty member to carry out his or her academic responsibilities, despite the opportunities for University faculty development or other appropriate interventions, is cause for consideration of dismissal from Fort Hays State University, by due process and following all procedures in the MOA and Faculty Handbook as applicable.

II. Implementation

A. Evaluation Process

The annual evaluation document used by each department will include a statement of the overall acceptable level of performance that meets faculty academic responsibilities, a provision for faculty development, and a statement of a faculty member's right to due process, including use of grievance procedures set out in the MOA, in the event any disagreement should arise in the course of the evaluation.

B. Individual Expectations

Fort Hays State University policy provides for differential allocations for effort among tenured faculty in the areas of their academic responsibilities. The individual's performance expectations for the period are determined by the allocation of effort and the departmentally-established responsibilities in an academic area. These expectations will serve as the basis for the individual's annual reviews-as outlined in the annual evaluation process.

C. Evaluation

Each faculty member shall be evaluated annually by the department chair using the criteria outlined in this document. When a tenured unit faculty member's overall performance falls below the minimum acceptable level, as indicated by the annual faculty member's evaluation, the department Chair shall so indicate on the evaluation form and in writing to the faculty member.

The faculty member will provide relevant information for the purposes of evaluation. Multiple sources of information used to evaluate the teaching component will include students' ratings of instruction and such other information as may be appropriate.

If the annual evaluation reveals that a faculty member's performance is below departmental expectations in one or more of the three areas of responsibility (i.e., teaching, scholarship, and service), the written evaluation shall be specific in describing the deficiencies and in suggesting methods for improvement. The department chair will also review the assignment of differential effort with the faculty member and they will decide what changes are appropriate and practical. Changes in the distribution of effort will be documented in the faculty member's personnel file.

D. Appropriate Interventions, Including Faculty Development Options

Faculty development is the term used for the University's investment in its faculty. While primarily relied upon to promote development, it may be utilized for corrective action.

When a tenured faculty member's overall performance falls below the minimum acceptable level, the department chair, after meeting with the Dean of the college, will consult with the individual about development and/or improvement activities and will also indicate in writing a suggested course of action to improve the performance of the faculty member. The suggested course of action may include appropriate provisions for faculty development, or for other appropriate interventions, such as counseling, medical leave or a change in teaching assignments. The department chair may call upon the University administration for assistance in constructing such a plan, including provision for additional resources, where needed. A faculty member may reject any plan recommended to aid performance levels, but the faculty member must understand that a sustained overall failure to meet departmental expectations is a basis for dismissal. In subsequent annual evaluations, the faculty member will be required to report on activities aimed at improving performance and provide a listing of improvement initiatives, efforts and results. The names of faculty members who fail to meet minimum standards for the year following the department chair's suggested course of action will be forwarded to the Dean of the College of Business and Leadership.

E. Recommendation for Dismissal

If a faculty member has two successive or a total of three evaluations in any five-year period in which minimum standards are not met, the “dismissal for cause” will occur subject to the results of any appeal pursued in accordance with the MOA. In making this determination, the department chair and review committee must state the nature of the failure to meet the departmental expectations, the reasons for this failure, the number of years that the faculty member has failed to meet departmental expectations, the level of discernible improvement in the faculty member’s performance after being notified of any failure in performance, and the extent to which the faculty member has complied with the terms of any plan developed to improve the faculty member’s performance.

The findings of sustained failure must not abuse academic freedom or be used as a cover for discriminatory, unfair, arbitrary, or capricious dismissal.

The “overall acceptable level of performance” as approved by the Management and Marketing department in the College of Business and Leadership pursuant to the MOA is described below.

TEACHING

Overall, a faculty member is expected to provide appropriate learning opportunities for students, an environment conducive to learning and intellectual development, and evaluations of students’ performance. Faculty members are responsible for establishing and maintaining academic or professional qualifications to ensure currency and relevance in their field. Mitigating or unusual circumstances and conditions that may affect teaching performance should also influence the evaluation of teaching performance and be identified. Faculty who do not earn at least 30 points (out of a total of 60) during an evaluation period will be considered to be below departmental expectations relative to teaching.

SCHOLARSHIP

Every faculty member is expected to be engaged in scholarly activity. Scholarly activity is evidence of a faculty member’s intellectual development and currency of knowledge. Faculty who are determined to be neither academically or professionally qualified will be considered to be below departmental expectations relative to scholarship.

SERVICE

Service to the University, College of Business and Leadership, department, the region, and profession is expected of each faculty member. However, some faculty members may have assignments which require significantly greater emphasis in this area than others.

Faculty members engaged in extensive scholarly activities or more time-consuming teaching responsibilities may not be as active in service. Given a faculty member's service assignments, he or she is expected to participate in achieving the goals and objectives pertaining to the service assignments. Faculty who do not earn at least 10 points (out of a total of 20) during an evaluation period will be considered to be below departmental expectations relative to service.

LOW PERFORMANCE

During any given year, numerous events or activities may negatively impact a faculty member's performance in one area. For example, (a) a heavy teaching load may severely limit the time available for scholarly activity; (b) new courses, the number of courses or course preparations, the nature of course material, rapidly changing course content, and the nature and level of work required of students may negatively affect students' course evaluations; (c) revision of papers submitted for publication or presentation may be extensive and time consuming and may severely limit the time available for other professional areas; or (d) administrative assignment and/or a heavy service assignment may severely limit a faculty member's time available for scholarly activity. These factors will be considered in making such decisions.

Recommended and approved by the faculty of the Management and Marketing Department, Dean of the College of Business and Leadership, and Provost of Fort Hays State University on March 5, 2007.

This document replaces all the existing pertinent departmental and College of Business and Leadership faculty development and evaluation documents.