

Department Approval March 19, 2021 (revote
January 28, 2022)
College Approval: June 6, 2022
University Committee Approval: July 22, 2022
Provost Approval: July 22, 2022

**College of Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics
Department of Agriculture
Criteria for Promotion in Academic Ranks**

Introduction

Based on the sample Record of Service provided in the University Faculty Handbook, the faculty of the Department of Agriculture present in this document a format for the preparation of the candidate's Record of Service and criteria for its evaluation for promotion. The purpose of this document is to help the candidate gather data and prepare his or her record of service, and to assist departmental, college, and university committees and administrators in evaluating the candidate's record of service.

These criteria have been developed in accordance with University promotion policies: *the promotion considerations will be based on the demonstration of significant and sustained achievement as indicated by evidence of Teaching Effectiveness, evidence of Professional Growth, and evidence of Service.* In fulfilling the goals and objectives of the College of Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics and the Department of Agriculture, items of evidence for these three categories should routinely be collected by the candidate as part of normal operating procedure, including faculty annual reports, annual evaluation by the Chairperson and the Dean, pertinent student input, and peer evaluations.

It is important that the candidate recognizes that recommendation for promotion in academic rank is *based on qualitative judgments concerning the evidence presented* by the candidate using the departmental Record of Service (Faculty Handbook). In all cases it is incumbent on the candidate to justify the inclusion of items. The committees and administrators *evaluate* the items of evidence provided for each category for their relevance towards *significant and sustained achievement* and express their judgments using the terms **Good, Superior, and Outstanding**. The detailed criteria outlined in this document are the minimum levels required for promotion.

Definitions

Review Period: The **review period** is at least the required minimum number of years in rank immediately preceding candidacy. Candidates who are in rank for more than the minimum number of years may choose to include any items of evidence produced during the time in rank, with a focus on the last four years.

Instructional: inclusive descriptor related to teaching, such as techniques in classroom presentation, curriculum, course development, and course materials development.

Refereed: descriptor of the process in which manuscripts, articles, papers, conference proposals, conference presentations, workshops, etc. are subjected to peer editorial review. Synonyms include the terms **peer-reviewed** and **juried**.

Publication¹: Dissemination via some public forum, such as refereed journal, transactions, or proceedings in printed or electronic form. Some publications, such as book reviews, reviews of refereed publications, or technical reports are also considered here, which may or may not have been refereed.

Item: An item is an achievement that must be supported by evidence. Example: a *published refereed paper or a published book review*.

Significance: Two aspects are used in measuring significance of an achievement: the type of item with supporting evidence and the importance of the item. The significance of an achievement is represented by its place in one of three clusters of excellence-levels of increasing recognition: Level A, Level B, and Level C. Items resulting from essential activities that are expected of every candidate for promotion are in Level A. Levels B and C enumerate additional items from which the candidate may select for demonstrating significant achievements. An item's relative value, its range of impact, and its success/failure status determine its specific placement in B or C. The candidate, in order to justify the significance of an item, will indicate its relevance, level of recognition, benefits, and other descriptions as appropriate.

Sustained: Sustained generally means spanning for more than one semester.

Academic Preparation Required for Academic Ranks

A Master's degree, in a field appropriate to the position held by the faculty member, is required for a person to hold a position at the rank of Instructor.

An appropriate doctoral degree – as determined by the College of Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics in conjunction with the Provost Office – is

¹ “Books, articles, and reviews are common forms used to demonstrate scholarly activity. Complete bibliographic information and copies of the material augmented by reviewer comments when available are helpful. Some indication of the stature of the publication (juried, circulation, national/regional scope) may provide assistance in judging the scholarly activity of the candidate. In the case of joint authorship, the candidate should indicate his/her contribution.”

Faculty Promotion Policy, “Evidence of Professional Growth”, item 1, p127.

required for a person to hold a position at the rank of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor.

Minimum Requirements and Ratings Needed for Promotion

Merit for Regular Non-Tenure Track: Final evaluation of the faculty member's performance must result in a rating of Superior or above for Teaching and for Service.

Promotion to Associate Professor. Final evaluation of the faculty member's performance must result in a rating of Superior or above for Teaching and for one of the other two categories, with at least Good in the remaining category.

Promotion to Professor and Post-Professorial-Merit. Final evaluation of the faculty member's performance must result in a rating of Outstanding in one category and Superior in the other two.

Criteria for Each of the Categories

The activities that are required to produce the various evidentiary items are listed for each of the three levels under each category. These lists are intended as a guide to assist candidates in planning their activities and reviewers in evaluating promotion documents. Since it is impossible to anticipate every kind of achievement in a field, candidates may include other activities and related evidence not specifically mentioned in this document, but the candidate must present arguments that these items are of equivalent significance. A candidate may present an instance of an evidentiary item in the Record of Service only once in levels B and C.

Criteria for the three levels of performance are stated at the end of each category. The number of evidentiary items and instances listed are the minimums needed for consideration at each performance level in each category.

I. Teaching Effectiveness.

Criteria for Teaching Effectiveness

For teaching effectiveness, faculty members will be evaluated on the basis of their performance in teaching and their contributions to the development and maintenance of high-quality curricula.

Note: Teaching effectiveness is the most important criterion in the overall evaluation of a faculty member and is also the most difficult to evaluate. For this reason, such evidence might include: student learning such as pre- and post-tests and samples of student work, peer observations, student ratings, and testimonials from current or former students.

Since student ratings are influenced by many non-academic variables, their ratings should never be used as the sole measurement of teaching performance.

Evaluative Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

Level A [The candidate must realize that level A is designed to assess classroom instruction, which is integral to the department's mission]

1. Carry out instructional activities expected of all faculty members as stipulated by university policy. These activities include providing class syllabi, meeting classes, providing instruction, evaluation of students, submitting grades (midterm and final grades).
2. Provide evidence for successful teaching. [The candidate must realize that providing evidence of successful teaching involves a detailed and explicit treatment of her/his teaching assignments during the period of rank. Classes should be examined for (i) content appropriateness, (ii) academic rigor, (iii) student expectations and (iv) measures of student evaluation. Classes taught over several semesters may be examined only once unless major changes are performed.]
3. Use feedback² from students and, where applicable, from peers to monitor and maintain or improve teaching effectiveness. Key to the improvement of faculty teaching is appropriately evaluating data and other measures of teaching performance and demonstrating that positive changes in course design and classroom teaching were accomplished because of these assessments.

Level B

1. Supervise internships. [The candidate needs to state the course prefix/title, semester during the period of rank, student name and title of project or topic.]
2. Supervise independent studies or student research. [The candidate needs to state the course prefix/title, semester during the period of rank, student name and title of project or topic.]
3. Update course content, materials, or delivery methods. [The candidate must state the course prefix/title, the nature of the improvement, level of improvement, and semester during the period of rank.]

² Note: The candidate's attention is drawn to the University Promotion and Sabbatical Leave Committee's statement (Memo October 13, 2005) regarding student feedback in this context: *While student evaluation cannot be mandated, it is important to remember that it is up to the candidate to make the case for his/her promotion. It may be difficult to make that case without formal evaluation (IDEA "/ SIR-II" and/or department form) from students*

4. Perform in curriculum revision or design. [The candidate should briefly indicate the nature of the curriculum design and their time frame during the period of rank.]
5. Share expertise and course material with departmental or professional peers. In most cases, this category involves assisting faculty. As an example, for evidence, a letter from the chairperson or colleagues would provide evidence for this category.
6. Attend or participate in activities that contribute to improved teaching (e.g., attend instructional workshops).
7. Receive an internal instructional grant or submit an external instructional grant.
8. Laboratory revision to incorporate emerging technologies. [This category may be viewed as renovating an entire laboratory sequence for a course or a series of laboratories across several courses.]
9. Make at least two presentations at a professional or local conference on an instructional topic.
10. Document that student advising during the period of rank supports student learning and career development.
11. Justify other comparable indicators of *teaching effectiveness* at this level. Each instance in this category, with appropriate evidence, should be considered as if it were a separate category.

Level C

1. Teach a new or existing course for the first time.
2. Develop a new course.
3. Develop teaching tools or become accomplished in teaching technology for online or distance teaching.
4. Receive an external instructional grant.
5. Publish refereed instructional material.
6. Conduct a tutorial, seminar, or workshop on a discipline-related topic at a professional conference.
7. Demonstrate using student ratings of instruction or peer reviews that at least one course indicates both teacher and course excellence.

8. Justify other comparable indicators of *teaching effectiveness* at this level. Each instance in this category, with appropriate evidence, should be considered as if it were a separate category.

Minimum Performance Levels for Teaching

Good. In order for teaching to be rated as good, the candidate must provide supporting evidence for all of A throughout the review period.

Superior. In order for teaching to be rated as superior, the candidate must provide supporting evidence for all of A throughout the review period, plus three items belonging to three different categories under B or C.

Outstanding. In order for teaching to be rated as outstanding, the candidate must provide supporting evidence for all of A throughout the review period, plus evidence of five items belonging to three or more different categories as listed under B or C, with at least one item from C.

II. Professional Growth

Criteria for Professional Growth

Faculty members will be evaluated on the basis of maintaining currency in the discipline and contributions to their area of specialization in agriculture. Contributions to the discipline may range from theoretical results through practical products and may be presented as journal articles, technical reports, or other outcomes designed to convey information to peers or the general public. It is required that the candidates indicate briefly their specific contributions in multi-authored items.

Evaluative Evidence of Professional Growth

Level A

Carry out professional growth activities expected of all candidates.

1. Remaining professionally engaged through a collection of scholarly activities, such as attending discipline-related conferences, meetings and field days.
2. Maintaining membership in a discipline-related professional organization.
3. Publish at least two refereed articles within the evaluation period. [The candidate must state importance of the refereed manuscripts]

Level B

1. Present a paper or poster at a professional meeting (state, national or international).

2. Publish reviews of books or journal articles. (Two items are required to satisfy this category).
3. Contribute a chapter to a discipline-related book.
4. Receive an internal grant or submit an external grant proposal.
5. Review proposals for a granting agency or manuscripts for a journal or a conference, etc. (Two items are required to satisfy this category)
6. Perform summer research or other professional development activities. The Department of Agriculture recognizes that some research **must** be performed during the summer period (growing season) and faculty members have ten-month contracts. [The candidate should demonstrate a reasonable consistency during the period in rank.]
7. Participate as a member of a panel on a discipline-related topic at a professional or local meeting.
8. Participate in a workshop or short course (participation indicates more than attendance will be needed to meet this category).
9. Publish an additional refereed article. The candidate must state importance of the refereed manuscripts. The faculty of the Department of Agriculture annually performs research at auxiliary facilities that require faculty-wide participation in planting, harvesting, animal care, writing, and data analysis. This research is appropriate for this category.
10. Justify other comparable indicators of *professional growth* at this level. Each instance in this category, with appropriate evidence, should be considered as if it were a separate category.

Level C

1. Publish a discipline-related book or act as editor for a discipline-related book. The candidate must show the importance of the achievement.
2. Receive an external grant. The candidate must show the importance or indicate the competitive nature of the grant.

3. Conduct a tutorial, seminar, or workshop on a discipline-related topic at a professional conference.
4. Perform major editorial functions for a journal or symposium/conference proceedings, etc.
5. Perform professional consulting.
6. Justify other comparable indicators of *professional growth* at this level. Each instance in this category, with appropriate evidence, should be considered as if it were a separate category.

Minimum Performance Levels for Professional Growth

Good. In order for Professional Growth to be rated as good, the candidate must provide supporting evidence for all of A throughout the review period.

Superior. In order for Professional Growth to be rated as superior, the candidate must provide supporting evidence for all of A throughout the review period, plus evidence of two instances from the categories listed under B or C.

Outstanding. In order for Professional Growth to be rated as outstanding, the candidate must provide supporting evidence for all of A throughout the review period, plus evidence of four instances from the categories listed under B or C, with at least one category in level C.

III. Service

Criteria for Service

Faculty members will be evaluated on the basis of service to students, service to the College and the University, service to professional bodies, and professional service to society or the community.

Evaluative Evidence for Service

Level A

1. Carry out service activities expected of all candidates. Such activities may include: participating actively in departmental decision-making and committees and providing information to prospective students.
2. Serve on one college or university-level committee or council for two or more years during the review period or perform a unique departmental function that substantially augments the department's mission.

Level B

1. Serve as chairperson for a departmental committee or serve on a college or university-level committee or council that required commitments beyond that described in level Service level A. The candidate should describe their contributions.
2. Provide support to students seeking internships, jobs, or graduate school opportunities. This category supports faculty creating internship or career events for groups of students or preparing special programs for mentoring students entering Pre-Veterinary Medicine or graduate programs. Letters of recommendation are allowable in this category, where 5 letters represent one instance.
3. Serve as an advisor or sponsor to a student organization, by leading extra-curricular field trips, coaching student teams in competitions, etc. The candidate should describe their contributions.
4. Carry out extra-departmental assignments, such as serving as a committee member for graduate students in other departments, volunteering for University Foundation activities, or assisting other University units in accomplishing their mission.
5. Provide professionally-related service to the community, such as classroom presentations, science fair or programming contest judging, career/college day presentations, or serving on advisory boards. The candidate should demonstrate a reasonable consistency during the period in rank.
6. Provide service to the discipline, such as chairing a session at a professional meeting or serving on a professional committee or task force. The candidate should demonstrate a reasonable consistency during the period in rank.
7. Justify other comparable indicators of *service* at this level. Each instance in this category, with appropriate evidence, should be considered as if it were a separate category.

Level C

1. Serve as chairperson of a college or university-level committee or council.
2. Provide service to a discipline-related organization or a higher education professional organization, such as performing major editorial functions, holding office in a professional body, or participating actively in the organization of a workshop or conference.
3. Develop or maintain an experiential learning facility on-campus or associated with the David M. Barton Agricultural Research Center, the Horticulture Greenhouse, the Nemanick Alternative Agricultural Gardens, experimental field at Sikeston Area

Higher Education Center, or similar auxiliary facilities, such as the Missouri Rice Research Farm. The candidate should describe their accomplishments and indicate a commanding leadership role.

4. Achieve mutually beneficial academic-industrial cooperation.
5. Provide voluntary professional service to the public, such as a non-profit agriculture-related organization (e.g. 4-H).
6. Provide leadership to a student organization that is justifiable as a contribution greater than that typically observed for IIIB3.
7. Justify other comparable indicators of *service* at this level. Each instance in this category, with appropriate evidence, should be considered as if it were a separate category.

Minimum Performance Levels for Service

Good. In order for Service to be rated as good, the candidate must provide supporting evidence for all of A throughout the review period.

Superior. In order for Service to be rated as superior, the candidate must provide supporting evidence for all of A throughout the review period, plus one item from either B1 or C3, plus three items belonging to two or more categories listed under B or C, including one that indicates service beyond the departmental level.

Outstanding. In order for Service to be rated as outstanding, the candidate must provide supportive evidence for all of A throughout the review period, plus one item from either B1 or C3, plus five items belonging to three or more categories listed under B or C, including one item from C that indicates service beyond the college level.