

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE
ANNUAL EVALUATION CRITERIA
Approved May 2018

I. General Policy. This document describes the teaching, research, and service criteria for annual evaluation of faculty in the department of political science. Annual evaluation is based on assignment. The following teaching, research, and service criteria are used for faculty members with a 3-2 (75% and 50%) teaching assignment. Instructors do not have research or service assignments, therefore they will be evaluated only on teaching. Political Science research may involve multi-year research projects. Multi-year projects shall be taken into consideration for the annual evaluation. A book may be submitted for a second year.

The document will be reviewed by the Department when requested by a majority of the voting faculty.

II. TEACHING

A. Criteria. The department Tenure and Promotion Criteria and Procedures define the teaching activities that will be evaluated using the following indicators:

1. Data on student perceptions of teaching.
2. Peer review. A faculty member may choose to be reviewed by a tenured member of the department. The review may be based on syllabi and other appropriate teaching materials. A faculty may request classroom observation. The observation must be scheduled ahead of time.
3. Course syllabi, tests, and other course materials. Evidence of the development of new courses, curriculum, or programs, including the revision of courses and the development of new teaching methods.
4. Teaching and advising awards.
5. Advising.
6. Participation in professional development activities relating to pedagogy, publishing on teaching, or formal presentations concerning teaching and learning.
7. Chairing thesis committees; supervising enrolled students in research papers or projects.
8. Contributions to the department's teaching mission taking into consideration items such as:
 - a. required or elective courses
 - b. night or day scheduling
 - c. undergraduate or graduate courses
 - d. class size
 - e. number of course preparations
 - f. number of courses
 - g. grading standards
 - h. new courses/preparations
 - i. electronic learning

j. travel to campuses other than primary assignment

B. Annual Evaluation Ratings For Teaching.

Rating: Exceptional. Exceptional teaching as indicated by 1) high scores on the student perceptions of teaching forms; or 2) strong peer reviews; or 3) a demonstrated commitment to curriculum development, either by developing new courses or revising and/or updating currently offered courses; or 4) participating in pedagogy workshops; or 5) chairing thesis committees and/or supervising enrolled undergraduate and/or graduate students in research papers or projects; or 6) other material submitted which demonstrates commitment to teaching.

Rating: Outstanding. Quality teaching as indicated by 1) good scores on the student perceptions of teaching form; or 2) good peer reviews; or 3) demonstrated commitment to curriculum development, either by developing new courses or revising and/or updating currently offered courses; or 4) participating in pedagogy workshops; or 5) chairing thesis committees and/or supervising enrolled undergraduate and/or graduate students in research papers or projects; or 6) other material submitted which demonstrates commitment to teaching.

Rating: Good. Satisfactory teaching as indicated by scores on the student perceptions of teaching form; or 2) by peer review; or 3) no other teaching materials submitted for evaluation.

Rating: Needs Improvement. "Needs Improvement" as indicated by low scores on student perceptions of teaching form; or 2) peer reviews define teaching as below satisfactory; or 3) no evidence of efforts to improve teaching; or 4) no other teaching materials submitted for evaluation. The designation of "Needs Improvement" serves as an indication to the faculty member that future progress in this category is expected.

Rating: Unsatisfactory. To merit the rating of "Unsatisfactory," the faculty member must demonstrate performance that fails to meet departmental expectations. Failure to improve in the year after receiving a "Needs Improvement" rating will result in a rating of "Unsatisfactory."

III. RESEARCH

A. Policy. Research and scholarship activities and journal ranks are defined in the Department Criteria and Procedures For Tenure and Promotion. "Peer reviewed" is defined as reviewed by two or more anonymous reviewers independent of the editor or editor's institution. It is the responsibility of faculty members to submit evidence concerning the peer review process to the Chair. The faculty shall determine whether an article, book, book chapter, edited book or anthology, or monograph meet the departmental definitions of "peer reviewed." Preparation and submission of proposals and/or receipt of grants shall be considered in fulfillment of the research requirement. The department will maintain a list of ranked journals.

B. Annual Evaluation Ratings for

Research Rating: Exceptional

A ranking of "exceptional requires one of the following **and** one or more of the requirements to achieve a rating of "outstanding"

1. Publication of an article in a rank one journal which is peer-reviewed with national or international distribution.
2. Acceptance of a book manuscript or publication of a book with peer review independent of the institution. The published book may be submitted for a second year.
3. Grants received as a result of an external review process.
4. Acceptance or publication of a textbook.

OR

5. Two or more of the requirements in the “Outstanding” category.

Rating: Outstanding

1. Publication of an article in a journal which is not a rank one journal or is a regional journal.
2. Publication of a book without anonymous peer review process. The book may be submitted for a second year if two or more favorable reviews are provided as evidence of quality.
3. A book chapter; edited book or anthology; monograph; book review essays; presentation of papers at conferences; article in non-peer reviewed journals (rank three).
4. Substantive review(s) of a published book which has received an Exceptional evaluation in previous years.
5. Writing and submission of external grants.
6. Article or book chapter under review
7. More than one exceptional publication in the previous evaluation year

Rating: Good. Evidence of continuing research or creative activities or efforts to develop research projects.

Rating: Needs Improvement. No evidence of continuing research or creative activities or efforts to develop research projects. The designation of “Needs Improvement” serves as an indication to the faculty member that future progress in this category is expected.

Rating: Unsatisfactory. To merit the rating of “Unsatisfactory,” the faculty member must demonstrate performance that fails to meet departmental expectations. Failure to improve in the year after receiving a “Needs Improvement” rating will result in a rating of “Unsatisfactory.”

IV. SERVICE

A. General Policy. Service consists of those activities not clearly defined under teaching and

research which contribute to the University's missions. Service includes activities for which no significant compensation has been received and which contribute to the Department, College or University; to student activities outside the classroom; to the academic profession; and to government or local, national or international communities.

B. Criteria for untenured faculty members. Untenured faculty members are expected to focus primarily on service to the department with perhaps membership on at least one university college committee or task force prior to consideration for tenure. Untenured faculty may receive "Outstanding" or "Exceptional" ratings based solely upon their service to the department.

C. Criteria for tenured faculty

members. Rating: Exceptional.

Meets the criteria for "Outstanding" service and also performs a leadership role such as chairing a major committee or another activity which requires an unusual commitment of time or two or more of the activities listed below. One of the activities must be service to the Department.

Rating: Outstanding.

Meets the criteria for "Good" service and also performs at least two of the following:

Department, College, or University:

Serves on departmental, college or university committees; member of faculty governance body or special task force; organizing departmental events; community engagement.

Professional Organizations:

Reviews journal article or book reviews; participates at conferences through such activities as discussant or panel chair

Student Activities:

Organizing and supervising a student organization; organizing educational activities for students outside the classroom

Service to governments or local, national or international communities.

Rating: Good.

Participation in routine operation and governance of the department through regular attendance and participation at departmental meetings and other events and activities.

Rating: Needs Improvement

Limited contribution to routine departmental operation. Does not participate in or contribute to routine department operations such as meetings, committees, advising, and governance. The designation of "Needs Improvement" serves as an indication to the faculty member that future progress in this category is expected.

Rating: Unsatisfactory. To merit the rating of "Unsatisfactory," the faculty member must demonstrate performance that fails to meet departmental expectations. Failure to improve in the year after receiving a "Needs Improvement" rating will result in a rating of "Unsatisfactory."

V. Annual Evaluation Overall Rating. The Chair will weight teaching, research, and service according to the proportion of a faculty member's time assigned to each activity.