

Political Science Department Criteria for Merit Evaluations Spring 2006

This document is intended to be used as the PSC department's criteria and procedures for evaluating annual reports for merit purposes. It is specifically NOT considered to be equivalent to or a substitute for department or college promotion and tenure guidelines/criteria. These criteria and procedures are used for a very specific purpose- the evaluation of annual reports. The tenure and promotion process serves a different function, the time periods involved are different, and the consequences of decisions are different; thus, the criteria and processes involved are different. For example, it is possible to earn professional or even exemplary status in categories over a series of individual years within this merit evaluation system and still not meet department, college, or university criteria for promotion or tenure. All faculty members are responsible for being knowledgeable about department, college, and university criteria for promotion and tenure—and to use these as partial guides for their professional work and associated priorities throughout the promotion and tenure process.

TEACHING AND ADVISING

Professional: All of the following. For those not otherwise described, these items will be evaluated by the Chair. The guiding assumption here is that faculty members are, in fact, functioning in a “professional” manner on these items unless or until there are problems identified via students or others raising complaints. When any such complaint is raised, the Chair will consult with the faculty member about it, and the explanation and/or resolution will serve as input into the evaluation in this category.

1. Meeting assigned classes regularly
2. Holding at least the dept. minimum number of office hours (4-6 per week)
3. Syllabi include necessary content (documented via submission of syllabi to department at beginning of each semester)
4. Syllabi demonstrate currency in course content (documented via submission of syllabi to department at beginning of each semester)
5. Syllabi distributed in a timely fashion to all classes
6. Returning assignments in timely fashion
7. Being responsive in a timely manner to student communications regarding classes, advising, research work, etc.
8. Mean student evaluations above department established minimum. This minimum is defined as one half of a standard deviation below the college mean. Operationally, each faculty member will calculate, from the data sheet provided by Institutional Research labeled “All” for that faculty member, a grand mean based on the mean scores for all items on the form. The college mean and standard deviation data will be provided by the Chair. (documented via description)
9. Results of any required peer evaluations completed during the year must be submitted and meet department established minimum expectations based on annual departmental portfolio review for tenure earning faculty, and annual Chair review for tenured faculty. Course evaluations shall include an evaluation of the syllabus design, which should minimally include:
 - a) Contact information and office hours

Course Evaluations shall include an evaluation of the syllabus design, which should minimally include:

- a) Contact information and office hours
 - b) Course objectives
 - c) Clear description of course
 - d) Schedule of reading assignments
 - e) Grading system/method of assessment
 - f) Plagiarism policy
 - g) Classroom rules
 - h) Absentee/exam make-up policy
10. Carrying appropriate number of advisees (documented via description)
 11. Meeting advisees as needed
 12. Serving as an informal “internal consultant” to peers/colleagues on teaching (i.e. informal support of colleagues’ teaching) when requested. (documented via description) There is no intent here to penalize people who, for some reason during a year, have no requests for such assistance. Rather, this type of routine assistance is part of good collegial relationships- an element of a “professional” role; more time consuming or formal or continuous consulting/mentoring/assistance can be recognized in the “exemplary” category
 13. Seeking informal consultation on teaching from department/university colleagues in support of improving teaching. (documented via description) Complementary to #12, the seeking out of help when we perceive it might be beneficial is a routine part of the “professional” role, while engaging in more ongoing, structured or complex activities to improve one’s teaching might be seen as “exemplary” (unless it is part of a required “improvement plan” to remediate deficiencies). This item is not a “required” item but description of such peer input can be included as part of the faculty member’s work in the teaching area.
 14. Demonstration/documentation of professional development in teaching (documented via description)
 15. Meeting department’s teaching needs (e.g. cooperating in teaching needed courses within area of expertise, scheduling of courses, etc)
 16. Demonstration/documentation of out-of-classroom teaching with students as requested by Chair (from list of typical activities such as independent study, supervision of student research, overload courses, guest or other “extra” teaching, chairing thesis/dissertation committees, thesis/dissertation committee membership, honors projects, evaluation of comprehensive exams and /or doc student portfolios, or others as approved) (documented via description)
 17. Meeting special needs of students in classes as appropriate (e.g. handicapping conditions) (documented via description)

Exemplary: Meeting “professional” as defined above plus at least 3 of the following:

1. New course preparations (except e-courses for which extra payment is received for course development) that the faculty member has never before taught
2. Developing a new class that is new to the department
3. Formal/sustained mentoring of peers or junior faculty in teaching (documented)
4. Seeking out formal/sustained mentoring or consultation in teaching for reasons other than remedial (documented via description of suggestions/innovations incorporated, letter from mentor/consultant, etc)
5. Development/incorporation of significant new methods/models of

- suggestions/innovations incorporated, letter from mentor/consultant, etc)
5. Development/incorporation of significant new methods/models of teaching for classes (documented via description)
 6. Incorporating other significant teaching innovations to accomplish teaching goals (documented via description)
 7. Generating new contracts or other department desired new “markets” or locations for programs
 8. Overload teaching requested by department chair to fill dept need (i.e. not including e-courses that bring a separate payment)
 9. Achieving WAC, multicultural, international, women’s studies, or service learning certification
 10. Mean student evaluations for the year above dept. cutoff for “exemplary”—this is defined as ½ standard deviation above the “grand” college mean
 11. Extra significant out-of-classroom teaching activities (beyond dept. expectations for “professional” in list in that section) (documented via description). This could count as service at an individual’s discretion, but it may not count as service and teaching/advising.
 12. Receipt of teaching awards
 13. Teaching Honors classes, Yeager seminars
 14. Other external recognition of high quality teaching (documented)
 15. Multiple preparations in a given year (more than typical for dept. faculty, in response to department/program area needs) (documented via description)
 16. Team teaching that involves extra work or innovative strategies (documented via description)
 17. Receipt of particularly high quality feedback on teaching other than standard student evaluations (i.e. seeking out and receiving high quality peer reviews of teaching) (documented via description or inclusion of feedback report)
 18. Significant innovations in student assessment methods (documented via description)
 19. Travel for teaching that is otherwise not recognized via special compensation or reduction in load (documented via description)
 20. Incorporating students into research projects (documented via description)
 21. Other significant teaching contributions to meet the mission of department or university (documented via description)

SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY

Professional: Demonstration of the following: (all are to be documented via description detailed enough to demonstrate actual progression of work, if that is what is being claimed; alternatively, faculty member may attach copies of manuscripts, papers presented, letters from editors, etc)

1. Ongoing involvement in discipline or professional role related scholarly work
2. Demonstrable development of or progress on discipline or professional role related scholarly/creative projects as evidenced by initial presentation of, or year to year documented progress on work as sequenced or described below. Work should not be cited more than once to justify a higher rating. (If for some reason the same work is cited in two or more places, be sure to make the rationale clear). If there is continuity of a project from previous years, you should be explicit and clear about the work done since the previous reporting period.

A. Individual Progress Report review of project/ annual updates

I. Design of study

A. Individual Progress Report review of project/ annual updates

- I. Design of study
- II. Literature review
- III. Data collection
- IIII. Data analysis
- V. Lab time logs
- VI. Project-related participation in writing groups
- VII. Submission of manuscripts (document via title, brief abstract and name of journal to which the manuscript is submitted; this is only for manuscripts not yet published or otherwise noted in the Annual Review (AR))
- VIII. Submission of grant applications (document via title, brief abstract and name of funding source to which grant application is submitted; only for grant applications not yet funded or otherwise noted in the AR)
- IX. Submission of book proposals (document via title, brief summary or table of contents and name of publisher to which manuscript is submitted; only for books not yet published or otherwise noted in the AR)
- X. Submission of major (regional, national/international) conference proposals (document via title, brief abstract and name of conference to which proposal is submitted; only for conference proposals not yet presented or otherwise noted in the AR)
- XI. Receipt of editorial reviews/critiques and work on revisions, resubmissions
- XII. Notification of “in press” status of written work (only for work not otherwise noted in the AR)
- XIII. Notification of acceptance of conference presentations (only for work not otherwise noted in the AR)
- XIIII. Notification of grant approval (only for work not otherwise noted in the AR)
- XV. Evidence of citations of work or reviews of work

Exemplary: Professional involvement as defined above, plus one (1) from items 1-4 or three (3) from items 5-15 below as a primary or significant contributor (all are to be discipline or professional role related and documented via standard citation format):

1. Publishing book; (by professionally recognized publisher—not vanity press; for test banks or workbooks, see #14 below)
2. Publishing chapter in edited book (by professionally recognized publisher—not vanity press)
3. Publishing journal article in a refereed/peer reviewed journal. To count in this category, the journal should be circulated nationally, available in a professionally reputable search engine, or otherwise credible as a “national” journal.
4. Receiving external research/scholarly/creative grants or contracts
5. Scholarship based, refereed presentations at regional, national or international conferences (each counts as a separate item)
6. Invited addresses at regional, national or international conferences

- international conferences (each counts as a separate item)
- 6. Invited addresses at regional, national or international conferences (each counts as a separate item)
- 7. Editing (primary editor) of journal (with appropriate documentation, might count as equivalent to 2 items)
- 8. Journal manuscript reviewing (document via description the extent of reviewing work)
- 9. Publishing book review essays
- 10. Submitting external research or scholarship based grant proposals
- 11. Creative production
- 12. Presentation at state conference (maximum of one per year; additional presentations of this type may count in the service category, if they are appropriately construed as service presentations)
- 13. Applied research/consulting (maximum of one item per year)
- 14. Publishing test bank or workbook by a professionally recognized publisher—not a vanity press (maximum of one item per year)
- 15. Publishing in a state-level journal or other professional outlet not covered by #3 above (maximum of one item per year)
- 16. Serving as Discussant at a conference (maximum one item per year)
- 17. Presenting scholarly research at a professional forum (maximum one per year)

SERVICE

Professional: The Chair’s evaluation will include “collegiality” as an important aspect of “professional” level service. Such issues as timely responses to requests for information or replies to information requests by Chair or colleagues and following through on department related tasks or projects will factor significantly into the Chair’s evaluation. Repeat or patterned problems in this area will result in a rating lower than “professional.”

In addition to the above, professional includes all of the following (documented via description)

- 1. Attending department faculty meetings
- 2. Serving on at least one department committee
- 3. Serving on at least one college or university committee or performing other college/university service (except for new faculty members for 2 years). Examples include standing committees, ad-hoc committees, other programs (e.g. international programs, multicultural affairs, sponsoring student groups) or agreeing to special service requests from other units/administrators.
- 4. Accepting requests to serve in special service situations as needed by department or college
- 5. Performing peer reviews of faculty colleagues
- 6. Peer consultation/support (except new faculty for 2 years)

Exemplary: all of the above, plus at least 3 of the following (documented via description; faculty member may attach other documentation if helpful to clarify role/responsibilities):

- 1. Serving as a Program Coordinator (unless person receives reassigned time, that would require including this role in “administration” category)
- 2. Extra informal advising, meeting with or otherwise communicating (e.g. email interactions, phone calls) with prospective or current students or other interested persons.
- 3. Participating in student recruitment activities
- 4. Serving on more than minimum number of committees or other

- students or other interested persons.
- 3. Participating in student recruitment activities
- 4. Serving on more than minimum number of committees or other service activities at any level
- 5. Chairing department, college, or university committees (chairing a standing committee or significant, time consuming ad hoc committee may count as 2 items; documented via description).
- 6. Bringing students to present at conferences
- 7. Organizing special events (e.g. speakers, conferences, meeting, etc);
- 8. Involvement in special projects on behalf of department or university
- 9. Acquiring new resources for department or university
- 10. Serving on community boards or committees
- 11. Giving professional talks/presentations to community groups
- 12. Serving as an officer in professional organization
- 13. Serving on professional organization committees
- 14. Serving as a department or university resource for media outlets
- 15. Pro bono professional work
- 16. Professional consulting
- 17. Participating in ongoing community programs (using professional skills/knowledge)
- 18. Tutoring or other application of professional knowledge/skills to help with community needs.
- 19. Applied/action research to benefit community organizations
- 20. Presentation at state conference (presentations of this type may count in the service category, if they are appropriately construed as service presentations, such as training workshops)
- 21. Other (define/document; “other” contributions must be consistent with *Greenbook* and College definitions of “service” to be credited)

ADMINISTRATIVE

Faculty members who receive reassigned time for administrative duties must include the administrative category in their weightings; others with administrative responsibilities may choose to do so.

Professional: demonstration of the following (documented via description)

1. Carrying out the routine expectations of the administrative role, as expressed in the written role description for that job. Examples would include (for Chair):
 - a. Development of teaching schedules
 - b. Scheduling and leading department meetings
 - c. Submitting required reports in a timely fashion
 - d. Establishing needed department committees
 - e. Responsible oversight of department and budget lines
 - f. (etc)

Each administrative role must have a written description on file that includes expected tasks and functions. If such a role description is included in a university publication (e.g. the *Greenbook*) that description may suffice.

2. Evaluations of work in that role by peers or others at least at the minimum level established by the department.

Exemplary: demonstration of at least 1 (one) of the following

1. Excellent or exemplary evaluations by peers or others of work in that role

1. Excellent or exemplary evaluations by peers or others of work in that role
2. **Any extra work on behalf of the administrative unit of responsibility. This work should advance the mission of that unit, and the administrator should be able to document his/her involvement or contributions.**

Proposed Evaluation Procedure

Nothing in the criteria or procedures is intended to or should be used to harm or otherwise interfere with the legitimate needs of faculty members who are on leave, on sabbatical, newly hired or in other such situations that aspects of the criteria or procedures do not reasonably apply to them. In such cases, the faculty member and Chair should negotiate a reasonable set of alternatives to the specific items that are problematic and inform the department committee of those arrangements.

1. Each faculty member submits the completed annual report (AR) form as required by Academic Affairs
2. Each faculty member is expected to document his or her contributions as outlined above. For all items in which “significant” contributions are expected to meet the exemplary standard, it is the faculty member’s responsibility to document why the item is “beyond the norm” expected of professional quality faculty work, and it is then the Chair’s responsibility to evaluate that documentation and make a judgment as to whether the level of contribution represented by the item meets his/her expectations or definition of “significant.”
3. AR forms are submitted to the Chair by announced deadline and reviewed/evaluated by the Chair.
4. As needed or requested, ARs are reviewed by the elected department Merit Review committee. (Full department [all tenured and tenure-track faculty] will elect a 3 person “Merit Review committee” (members to come from tenured faculty) to act as an additional review panel in the case of any complaints that are not resolvable by the faculty member and the chair, to automatically review any cases of faculty receiving ratings of Needs Improvement or Unacceptable, and to review Chair’s AR. Any faculty member can request a review by the committee.
5. Weightings:

Chair - 100%; unless there is an unresolved disagreement;
If so, then Committee 100%

6. Dean’s Role: The Dean has three overlapping roles and one distinct role in this process. First, she oversees the evaluation plans of all COLA departments to determine that these are reasonable and that the criteria established for each category are essentially equivalent, even though each department may have somewhat different methods or substantive priorities. Second, she reviews the OCRs for all faculty to ensure that the departments’ procedures and criteria are being used consistently and fairly; in this role, she reserves a “right of refusal” to approve or sign off on any OCR if she has a substantive basis for believing that the department’s process is not being followed appropriately. Third, she serves as a level of review/conflict resolution if there is an unresolved dispute at the department level. In addition, the Dean will provide independent input into the administrative category evaluation for the department chair, such input to be calculated as 50% of the total score for the Chair in the administrative category.
7. Overall Composite Ratings (OCRs). For each area of responsibility that a faculty member achieves a rating of “professional,” his or her numerical rating will be a 3; for each area that is “exemplary,” the rating will be a 4. If there is an area that did not meet

her numerical rating will be a 3; for each area that is “exemplary,” the rating will be a 4. If there is an area that did not meet expectations for “professional” the rating will either be a 2 (needs improvement) or 1 (unacceptable). Either of the latter two ratings will only be arrived at by way of a rating based on a review by both the Chair and the department Merit Committee; in other words, a Chair rating of 2 or 1 in any category will automatically trigger a review by the committee. Ratings in each area are multiplied by the individual weightings assigned to those areas by the faculty member (which should have summed to a total of 100%), and the resulting figures are then summed to calculate the OCR.