

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

I. Overview: Scope and Application

All tenure-track and tenured Political Science faculty will engage in the three interrelated domains of faculty work: teaching, scholarship, and service. Teaching will typically require more time and effort than the other two domains, but all three are equally important in consideration of retention, promotion, and tenure at Indiana State University. The relative balance between the three domains for a specific tenure-track and tenured faculty member will be based on faculty interests and concurrence by the department chair; extra-departmental assignments may also affect the relative balance between the three domains.

Instructors will primarily have responsibilities in the domain of teaching, but responsibilities in the domain of service and/or scholarship may be possible upon the mutual agreement of the faculty member and the department chair; such agreements shall be written into a memorandum of understanding (MOU) and shall guide the review of the Instructor's performance.

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 tenured and tenure track members of the Political Science faculty are expected to engage in such pursuits on a regular basis. Instructors will only be expected to demonstrate satisfactory performance in this domain if they are assigned responsibilities in it per a departmental MOU.

A. Scope of Guidelines

1. These guidelines are applicable to all regular, full-time faculty members in the Political Science Department. Regular faculty include those faculty ranked as pre-tenured assistant professor; tenured associate and full professors; and full-time instructors.
2. These guidelines shall be used as a framework within which the relevant departmental committees, the department chair, and the department as a whole shall evaluate the retention, promotion, and tenure of faculty within the department.
3. In accordance with general University practice, the evaluation of faculty performance will focus on three domains of activities of teaching effectiveness; research and scholarly activities; and service.
4. Within and across these three domains, regular faculty in the Political Science department – like all ISU faculty – are expected to contribute to the mission, vision, and values of the university, college, and department. Candidates for retention, promotion and tenure in the

Department of Political Science shall be evaluated on the extent and the value of their university mission-based activities within and across the three domains of faculty activity, as directed by the University Handbook, section 305.2.3 and the College Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Guidelines (II.A.2, p. 4). The Handbook, in sections 305.2.2.1-4, defines the four mission-based activities to include undergraduate student academic advising; graduate student advising / mentoring; community engagement; and experiential learning.

Mission-based activities do not constitute a separate domain of faculty evaluation, nor do they replace, as a separate domain, any of the other three. But in accordance with the University Handbook, section 305.2.3, they shall be integrated into the three domains, as provided elsewhere in this document.

5. Candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor shall demonstrate effective teaching, a record of scholarship that has earned professional recognition at the international, national, or regional level, and effective service to the University (including department and/or College) and to either the community or the profession.

Candidates for promotion to Senior Instructor shall demonstrate effective teaching and continuous professional growth in teaching, and shall demonstrate satisfactory achievements in scholarship and/or service if they have been assigned responsibilities in either of these additional domains of activity.

Candidates for promotion to Professor, in accordance with University Handbook section 305.12.4.5, now have two methods to demonstrate their accomplishments.

- a. Provide documented evidence of substantial and effective teaching; of a record of substantial accomplishments in scholarship that has led to professional recognition at the national level; and of active, substantive service to some combination of the University, the community, and the profession.
- b. Provide documented evidence of excellence in one domain of faculty work, while also demonstrating substantial and/or sustained performance in the other two domains.

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, and they strive to continuously improve their craft.

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.

Pre-tenure faculty and Instructors who are being reviewed for retention shall provide to the department evidence of effective teaching. Regular faculty who are being reviewed for promotion and/or tenure shall provide to the department evidence of teaching that is progressing from effectiveness toward excellence. An associate professor who is applying for promotion to the rank of professor who chooses to demonstrate excellence in teaching under the alternate path to promotion shall document that excellence with the receipt of the College of Arts & Sciences Teaching Award (in the domain of teaching), the University's Caleb Mills Distinguished Teaching Award, and/or a similar external award for excellence in teaching from a recognized organization.

Satisfactory retention evaluations, tenure evaluations, and evaluations for promotions shall consider departmental reviews of teaching using the following criteria:

- The demonstrated ability of the faculty member to create a well-organized course
- The creation by the faculty member of an appropriate environment to facilitate learning in the classroom or online
- The demonstrated ability of the faculty member to achieve the learning goals stated in the syllabus for each course
- Student evaluations of teaching by the faculty member that generally meet or exceed the University average scores on the University-approved evaluation mechanism
- Positive peer teaching evaluations, as well as improvements in areas where constructive criticism has been provided through previous peer teaching evaluations

In addition to these criteria, departmental reviews of a faculty member's teaching will take into consideration:

- The number of separate course preparations by the faculty member
- The number of new course preparations
- The number of large classes that a faculty member teaches
- The number of Foundational Studies course that a faculty member teaches
- The supervision of internships and/or readings courses
- The incorporation of innovative pedagogies
- Participation on master's theses or doctoral dissertations
- The facilitation of experiential learning by students through field trips or other pedagogical mechanisms
- The inclusion of community engagement activities in courses
- Co-authoring papers with students when the faculty member takes on a mentoring role to the student
- Participation in workshops/courses to improve one's teaching, and demonstrated incorporation of pedagogical elements from those workshops/courses when appropriate

Classroom observations of pre-tenure faculty and Instructors will be conducted at least once per Academic Year by members of the department's Personnel Committee (the specific observer[s] to be chosen by the Personnel Committee). Tenured faculty seeking promotion should be observed at least once after receiving tenure and prior to applying for promotion. The faculty member being observed must be given reasonable (e.g., at least one week) prior notification regarding the prospects of a classroom visitation. After the classroom visit, the observer will

prepare a written report of the visitation, with copies going to the faculty member, the departmental Personnel Committee, the department chairperson, and to the faculty member's departmental personnel file.

Regarding student evaluations of faculty teaching:

1. The university-adopted student evaluation tool will be adopted by the department, and may include optional items devised by the instructor.
2. The persons receiving the results of the student evaluations in the first instance (the instructor and the department chair) will simultaneously receive an identical body of materials, including written comments of students. If the student evaluations are not sent directly by the university to the department chairperson, then the faculty member shall forward those results to the chairperson in a timely manner.
3. Additional analysis of the raw data may be requested by either the instructor or the evaluating committee.
4. 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.

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

General

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 for community organization or government agency that draws on disciplinary expertise

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.

In each of these three categories, faculty are encouraged to involve undergraduate and/or graduate students in their research and scholarship (when appropriate). This mentorship in research and scholarship provides important experiential learning opportunities for those students.

Within the appropriate categories, scholarship on teaching and learning will be given equal weight as traditional political science scholarship.

While there are no specific "annual quotas" which need to be met, it is expected that pre-tenure faculty members, tenured faculty members seeking promotion, and Instructors seeking promotion (when appropriate) will demonstrate satisfactory progress in the area of research/publications.

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 regular 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 regular faculty is not dependent on satisfactory progress in the area of research/publications. Subsequent retention evaluations shall consider the candidates' progress towards peer-review publications.

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) and promotion from Instructor to Senior Instructor (usually 6 years).

A faculty member applying for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor or promotion to Senior Instructor 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. Instructors seeking promotion only have these research expectations when part of their semester duties is dedicated to research/scholarship/creative activity.

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

A faculty member applying for promotion to professor should demonstrate a record of substantial scholarly achievement that has garnered national recognition subsequent to being promoted to Associate Professor and granted tenure. Four to six peer-refereed journal articles (or their equivalent) over the course of approximately six to eight years would demonstrate this sustained, substantial progress, with the scholarship occurring primarily in Category 1 but possibly also in Category 2. Gaps in scholarly output due to personal or professional reasons can be taken into consideration by the department.

Scholarly progress towards these quotas for a faculty member shall be understood to include, but is not limited to such actions:

- A signed contract from a reputable publisher
- Written notification of a grant award related to research
- Receipt of a travel grant to conduct or fund research
- A travel grant to attend a scholarly/research conference
- An invitation to publish a chapter for inclusion in an edited book project
- An invitation to compile an edited work (e.g. book)
- Written acceptance of an article for future publication in a refereed journal
- An invitation to contribute to an annotated bibliography published in a refereed publication
- A contribution to an online publication

A faculty member seeking to demonstrate excellence in this domain would demonstrate significantly more scholarly production than 4-6 peer-reviewed journal articles (or the equivalent) per approximately six to eight years post-tenure, or would be recognized for excellence in scholarship through receipt of the Dreiser Award or a significant external award for scholarship during the same time period.

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, like the College and the University, values and recognizes significant service contributions.

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. Satisfactory retention evaluations, tenure evaluations, and evaluations for promotion shall consider service contributions in these illustrative examples of activities, which include Mission-Based Activities (University Handbook 305.2.2), under each heading are listed as follows:

University

- Serving as an academic advisor for students (undergraduate and/or graduate)
- Chairing or performing a task for an active committee within the Political Science Department
- Directing or coordinating a program of study in the 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.

A new pre-tenure faculty member will generally have service expectations that are minimal to begin with, focusing more on service within the department or the College. Over the course of their pre-tenure probationary period, it is expected that they will gradually increase the amount of their service activity and that it will begin to include service to the University more broadly, as well as (when appropriate) to the community and the profession. Demonstrating a sustained level of service with gradual growth in their service activities will be necessary for retention.

An Instructor will not have any service obligations unless specified in the MOU with the department chairperson. If some degree of service obligation is included, then they will need to demonstrate achievement in the specified service duties as part of their annual review for retention.

For an Assistant Professor to be promoted to Associate Professor and granted tenure, they will need to demonstrate a pattern of effective service to the University (i.e. departmental, college, and/or University) and to either the community and/or profession.

For an Instructor to be promoted to Senior Instructor, they will need to demonstrate effective service to the University (including the department and/or College) and to the community or profession as stipulated in the MOU with the department chairperson.

For an Associate Professor to be promoted to Professor, they will need to demonstrate substantial service including leadership roles to the University (including the department and/or College) as well as to the profession and/or the community. Alternatively, a faculty member seeking to demonstrate excellence in this domain will provide documented evidence of sustained and substantial effective service to the University and to the profession and/or the community, with regular leadership positions in that service.

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 or achieved the rank of Senior Instructor, 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.

F. Candidates seeking promotion and tenure may apply before their sixth probationary year as outlined in the University Handbook (305.16.6.1). If a negative recommendation occurs during such a review, that candidate shall be reviewed in a subsequent year(s) without prejudice.

APPROVALS

Revisions approved by the Political Science Department, February 27, 2018 (7-0-1).

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