

POLITICAL SCIENCE DEPARTMENT GUIDELINES FOR RETENTION, PROMOTION, and TENURE EVALUATIONS

I. Overview: Scope and Application

A. Scope of Guidelines

1. These guidelines are applicable to all regular, full-time faculty members in the Political Science Department.
2. They should be taken as frameworks within which the relevant departmental committees, the department chair, and the department as a whole will operate.
3. In accordance with general University practice, the evaluation of faculty performance will focus on three general categories of activity, which are:
 - a. Teaching effectiveness
 - b. Research/publication activities
 - c. Service to the department and the University, the community and/or the larger profession

II. Teaching--Evaluative Criteria and Standards of Performance

The department seeks faculty members who are knowledgeable, who will participate in the intellectual life of the University, and who will challenge students to understand the importance of political study in becoming educated persons. Good teachers vary in their classroom behavior, but they all approach their tasks with intellectual honesty and seriousness of purpose.

Students should be treated like apprentices in the world of scholarship, not customers in search of a credential. We want our students to work, to learn basic skills, to examine their biases and preconceptions, and to acquire the perspectives of citizens concerned with the general welfare as well as their own political needs.

The department values both the quantity and quality of a colleague's teaching contribution. Quantity includes contact hours, numbers enrolled, and number of preparations. Also relevant to the amount of teaching are overload assignments whether voluntary or unavoidable. Supervision of readings courses or internships, and service on Masters thesis or paper committees also will be considered.

Quality of teaching is judged by peers in the department, using clear criteria and considered judgment, in conformity with procedures in the department's by-laws. Student course evaluations and classroom observations are indicators required of all pre-tenured faculty members. Student evaluations that meet the department's standards as evaluation instruments should be utilized in all courses.

Classroom observations will be conducted as least once per semester by members of the department's Tenure and Retention Committee (the specific observer[s] to be chosen by the Tenure and Retention Committee). The instructor being observed must be given reasonable (e.g., at least one week) prior notification regarding the prospects of a classroom visitation. Classroom visitations by external observers may be employed as needed in special cases. (For example, where the nature of a course's material is such that no one in the department feels qualified to serve as an observer). In all instances, the arrangements for classroom visitations should be mutually agreeable to both parties. Moreover, the observer will prepare a written report of the visitation, with copies going to the faculty member and to the faculty member's departmental personnel file.

Student course evaluations and/or classroom visitations, while not required, are recommended as part of the evaluation package for tenured faculty members who are applying for promotion or who wish to demonstrate meritorious teaching effectiveness to the department's Salary Committee.

Still other indicators of quality instruction include accessibility to students, pertinent postdoctoral coursework or training, evidence of course development or innovation, some aspects of student advisement, supervision of readings courses or independent study, service on a master's thesis or paper committee, coauthoring papers with students where the faculty member takes a mentoring role with the student, and interaction with students in extra-classroom settings. Other activities include facilitating the experiential learning of students through such activities as supervision of field trips, internships, and student community engagement, both on and off campus. The department member might also wish to demonstrate instructional/communication skills by participating in department colloquia or by giving presentations accessible to a general audience.

Peers must use specifiable criteria in evaluating teaching, but no comprehensive listing will apply in a given case. Peers will respect the need for a diversity of personalities, strengths, teaching styles, and approaches to teaching. Peers have the obligation to protect the instructor's complete freedom to pursue the truth wherever it may lead.

Where utilized, student evaluations of faculty teaching will proceed in accordance with the following policies:

1. Departmental committees will give full credence to methods of teaching evaluation in addition to SIRs.
2. A single standard form such as the SIR II published by the Educational Testing Service will be adopted by the department, and may include optional items devised by the instructor.
3. The instrument is to be administered by an administrative assistant, a graduate assistant, or student in the class. The person who administers the evaluation will return the evaluations directly to the department administrative assistant. The instructor is not to be present in the class at the time the forms are filled out. Results will be processed by the testing service, but shall not be released until all grades have been turned in.

4. The persons receiving the results in the first instance (the instructor and the department chair) will simultaneously receive an identical body of materials, including written comments of students.

5. Additional analysis of the raw data may be requested by either the instructor or the evaluating committee.

6. Data based on student evaluations do not speak for themselves. Peers will evaluate such data in the context of the talents, interests, and attitudes of students; the demands of the subject matter; and departmental teaching objectives.

To assist the evaluation committees in their work and assure the faculty member maximum opportunity to contribute input to the evaluation process, all pre-tenured faculty members should maintain an annual "Portfolio of Teaching Materials." These portfolios, which should contain such material as course syllabi, copies of exams, study guides, and the like, will be made available to all committees involved in the evaluation of pre-tenured faculty. Such portfolios, while not required, are recommended as part of the evaluation package for tenured faculty members who are applying for promotion or who wish to demonstrate meritorious teaching performance to the department's Salary Committee.

III. Research/Publication Activities--Evaluative Criteria and Standards Of Performance

General

Pursuant to the general guidelines for faculty evaluation operative within the College of Arts and Sciences, research and publication activities within the discipline or related interdisciplinary areas represent a major component of the evaluation of faculty performance within the Political Science Department; such activities constitute key inputs into evaluations/recommendations which are made on an annual basis (e.g., retention, salary increments) as well as those concerning promotion and tenure. Thus, all members of the Political Science faculty are expected to engage in such pursuits on a regular basis.

Within practically any discipline, including even those as multifaceted as Political Science with such well-developed subfields as American Politics, Comparative Politics, International Relations, Public Administration, and Normative/Empirical Theory, a general hierarchy of research/publication activities and accomplishments can be useful in facilitating the evaluation process. The following framework, which is based on general criteria applied within the Political Science discipline as a whole as well as on the distinctive nature/mission of the ISU Political Science Department, represents the various types of research/publication activity available to the faculty of the department to fulfill the College's requirement for having an impact on their professional field. The following categories of research/publication accomplishments are listed in descending comparative order.

Category 1:

(Basically major refereed publications or rough equivalent thereof)

- Books (Published or under contract; vanity presses not acceptable)
- Major grant project (based on award by external funding agency)
- Article in a refereed academic journal (published or accepted; includes special invitation to write an article for a journal which is refereed)
- Chapter in a book (book published or contracted; vanity presses not acceptable)

Category 2:

(Basically non-refereed publications, but entailing significant primary/secondary research):

- Article in a non-refereed academic journal (published or accepted)
- Major review essay in an academic journal (published or accepted)
- Consultant/applied research reports

Category 3:

- Formal academic paper presented at a recognized professional conference or academic forum
- Book review (published in or accepted by an academic journal)
- Significant external grant submissions

Within the evaluation process, activity in Category 1 will generally be considered more significant and therefore will in effect carry more weight than activity in Category 2. Likewise, activity in Category 2 will generally be considered more significant and therefore will in effect carry more weight than activity in Category 3.

While there are no specific "annual quotas" which need to be met, it is expected that pre-tenured faculty members and faculty members seeking promotion will demonstrate satisfactory progress in the area of research/publications. "Satisfactory progress" is defined as a momentum-building process wherein faculty members might initially concentrate their activities in categories 3 and/or 2, but will ultimately become active in category 1.

Satisfactory progress is absolutely essential to receive a favorable recommendation for promotion and/or tenure. While responsibility for determining whether satisfactory progress has been made rests ultimately with the committees involved in the evaluation process and the department chair, some suggested indicators of satisfactory progress are provided below. It is, of course, not only incumbent upon faculty members to develop and maintain the momentum necessary to demonstrate satisfactory progress, but it is also the responsibility, particularly when dealing with pre-tenured faculty members, of the Personnel Committee and especially the department chair to provide the earliest possible warning to a faculty member whenever it is felt that the faculty member is in danger of not developing and maintaining the momentum necessary to demonstrate satisfactory progress for tenure or promotion.

Retention

Recognizing that first-year faculty members are special cases in the sense that their initial evaluation is done after only a few months of affiliation with the department and they therefore

may not have had sufficient time to pursue their research/publication agendas, retention for such first-year non-tenured faculty is not dependent on satisfactory progress in the area of research/publications.

Progression in building momentum over the six-year period of tenure probation, especially for those faculty members hired at the assistant professor level, should be as follows (recognizing that there very well may be some overlap between activity in the various categories): Years 1 and 2--category 3; Years 2 and 3--category 2; Years 3 to 6--category 1.

Tenure and/or Promotion

1. Tenure and/or promotion from assistant professor to associate professor (minimum 4 years in rank at ISU, usually 6 years)

A faculty member applying for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor should be able to demonstrate that satisfactory progress has been achieved by having engaged in research/publication activity from the three categories (with emphasis on Category 1). Typically, the candidate will have 4-6 substantial refereed journal articles, or their equivalent, which have impacted the discipline or interdisciplinary area. Such refereed articles should appear in academic journals, not in conference proceedings or similar publications.

2. Promotion from associate professor to professor (minimum 4 years in rank)

A faculty member applying for promotion to professor should be able to demonstrate that satisfactory progress has been achieved by continuing to engage in research/publication activities in Category 1 subsequent to having been promoted to Associate Professor.

IV. Service Activities--Evaluative Criteria and Standards of Performance

Political scientists frequently have one foot in the more classic and contextual aspects of their subject, and the other in the study of current affairs or delivery of practical applications of knowledge. They are often called upon to interpret major events in the news, while being mindful of their scholarly obligations. The Political Science Department is therefore concerned that the reward structure of Indiana State University include tangible appreciation of the manifold types of service that professors in general, and political science professors in particular, do perform.

Here as elsewhere, a first step toward continued or enhanced awareness of the variety and vitality of service contributions is to list several of them by subtype. The department subscribes to an initial grouping of service into university, profession, and community headings; illustrative examples of activities under each heading are listed as follows:

University

- Serving as an academic advisor for students

- Chairing or performing a task for an active committee within the Political Science Department
- Serving on or chairing an interdepartmental, college-wide, or university-wide committee or organization
- Performing a function or fulfilling an office which includes an extra-departmental component
- Undertaking extra-campus promotion of an academic or other program or major event (or event series) for the university

Profession

- Serving as an editor or referee for a scholarly journal
- Participating on an evaluation panel for a research funding organization
- Serving as officer or active board member of a professional organization
- Reviewing a manuscript for a publisher or journal editor
- Serving as organizer, discussant and/or panel chair for a panel or section at a professional conference

Community

(NOTE: To be considered in the evaluation process, community service activities must be directly related to the faculty member's professional expertise and responsibilities. Thus, as is the case with research/publication activities, these community service activities must be grounded in the discipline or related interdisciplinary areas)

- Undertaking leadership or active membership in a committee or organization extending beyond the University, such as an advisory board
- Providing information or analysis for a notable or group, an official or officials, or a media outlet or outlets
- Participating in or leading a program or workshop for an organization, group etc.
- Performing a consulting or training duty for a public, civic, or political organization

Quantification and qualification in the service area is an especially difficult enterprise. We begin with the premise that we should frequently attach an importance to this area which (given the mission of this discipline at this institution) is equal to that of research and teaching. Secondly, we have supplied a listing of activities in the expectation that personal listings will be made, and that if "quality" were equal, more rather than fewer activities would be preferred. In addition, evidence of "quality" (including, presumptively, such indicators as "time spent on task," progress reports, and various items of intermediate and final written output) may also be submitted and would weigh in both merit and sufficiency calculations.

Many if not most of the service activities undertaken by an individual faculty member are taken in accord with her or his sense of the possibilities for appropriate and meaningful contribution. However, the department may also legitimately specify particular types of off-campus service activity as a part of an individual faculty member's job description.

V. General Procedural Principles

A. All recommendations will be based on articulated facts, established criteria, and considered judgment. It is the duty of the faculty member being evaluated to provide, either on her/his initiative if the faculty member has requested evaluation or in response to a formal request by an evaluating committee, the documentation necessary to make a positive recommendation. The evaluating committee will affirmatively assist in this process. Examples of such documentation are copies of publications and/or consulting reports, course syllabi, student course evaluations, letters of commendation for services rendered, etc. Inability on the faculty member's part to document progress/ performance or failure to supply reasonably requested information can be grounds for an adverse decision.

In addition, in those cases where the faculty member being evaluated is not yet tenured, the evaluating committee will have access to all prior annual evaluations by the Political Science Department, the College of Arts and Sciences, and the University.

B. Prior to making a recommendation to the department chair, an evaluating committee should provide the faculty member(s) being evaluated the opportunity to explain any extenuating circumstances which may have affected the faculty member's performance. In any case where a negative recommendation is being considered, the committee should formally solicit such an explanation before making its recommendation.

The faculty member should be permitted to put these explanations of extenuating circumstances in writing and these written explanations will become part of the material which is forwarded with the committee's recommendation.

In those instances where the chair does not concur with a positive recommendation of the evaluating committee, the chair should formally solicit an explanation of extenuating circumstances from the faculty member (if such a written explanation was not already provided by the recommending committee). The faculty member will be able to put these explanations in writing and the written explanations will become part of the material which is forwarded with the recommendations to the College of Arts and Sciences.

In all cases, the evaluating committee will provide a written summary of its findings as well as a written rationale for its decision, both of which will accompany the recommendation which is forwarded.

In those instances where the chair does not concur with the recommendation of the evaluating committee, the chair will first consult with the committee. If the chair still disagrees after consultation, the chair must provide a written summary of her/his findings as well as a written rationale for not concurring, both of which will be sent to the evaluating committee. Both the chair's recommendation (with supporting written material) and the committee's recommendation (with supporting written material) along with any written explanations of extenuating circumstances by the faculty member will then be forwarded to the College of Arts and Sciences.

C. All recommendations and related written material generated by the faculty member, the

committee, and the chair as part of a faculty performance evaluation will be placed in and become a part of the faculty member's permanent departmental personnel file.

D. Unless specified otherwise above, the existing By-Laws of the Political Science Department at Indiana State University (as approved 12/10/81) shall govern the faculty evaluation process with respect to the authority of specific committees to undertake the evaluation of faculty performance, with respect to the selection of membership of these committees, and with respect to the procedures which those committees will utilize in conducting the evaluation, deciding upon a recommendation, and forwarding the recommendation.

E. Unless specified otherwise above, the existing By-Laws of the Political Science Department at Indiana State University (as approved 12/10/81) shall govern the faculty evaluation process with respect to the authority and responsibilities of the department chair in the evaluation of faculty performance and with respect to the procedures which the chair will utilize in reviewing the committee's recommendation, concurring with or dissenting from the committee's recommendation, and forwarding the results of the department's evaluation process to the appropriate person(s) in the College of Arts and Sciences.

APPROVALS

Revisions approved by the Political Science Department (8-0-0), July 17, 2012

Minor revisions approved by the Political Science Department (5-0-0-4), May 7, 2010

Political Science Department--October 21, 1993

Dean, College of Arts and Sciences--November 10, 1993

Provost, Indiana State University—February 23, 1996