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UNIT PROCEDURES AND STANDARDS FOR
FACULTY TENURE, PROMOTION, AND SALARY TREATMENT

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

The Department is guided by standards and procedures set forth in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) as a general statement of policy on promotion, tenure, retention, and salary decisions. These unit standards and procedures are intended to be in addition to and consistent with those provided in the current CBA. In the event of any omission or inconsistency the CBA shall apply, but these unit standards shall prevail when its provisions are more rigorous than those of the CBA. A faculty member should consult the CBA for procedures relative to the evaluation process beyond those in this document, especially requirements for appeal.

I. PROCEDURES FOR TENURE, PROMOTION, RETENTION, AND SALARY EVALUATION

A. Faculty shall maintain a current and complete Individual Performance Record (IPR) of their teaching effectiveness and research and service activities. The IPR shall include any material deemed pertinent to the annual review procedure with respect to tenure, promotion, retention, and salary treatment.

B. The Department chairperson shall review annually with each probationary faculty member that person’s progress toward attaining tenure. Faculty whose performance is below these standards will discuss with the Department chairperson the nature of the deficiencies and a program of improvement.

C. The Student Evaluation Committee (SEC) shall comprise three students, two undergraduates from among the political science majors and one graduate MA or MPA student. The department chairperson will appoint students to the SEC and the FEC chairperson will monitor, but not participate in, their evaluation of faculty.

D. All tenured faculty members comprise the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC), which annually shall make tenure, promotion, retention, and salary evaluation recommendations at a special meeting called for that purpose. No faculty member shall participate in such recommendations affecting one’s own future. The FEC statement shall be made known to the faculty member being reviewed, who shall have the right to respond. The FEC shall select a chairperson from among its members.

E. The FEC chairperson will appoint a student observer from among the political science majors and/or graduate students. The student observer has...
the right to attend and participate in the discussion of the FEC meeting but
does not possess a right to vote.

F. In preparing recommendations for the evaluation meeting, the FEC
chairperson may solicit the written opinions of colleagues inside and
outside the Department, including persons recommended by the faculty
members themselves. These opinions shall become a part of the FEC
record, to which the concerned faculty member has a right to respond.

G. The FEC and the Department chairperson shall prepare separate
recommendations on each faculty member (including those tenured, tenure
track, and non-tenure track) and transmit them, along with the IPRs,
according to the procedures outlined in the CBA. The faculty member
being evaluated shall sign the separate recommendations of the Student
Evaluation Committee (SEC), FEC, and Department chairperson.

II. TEACHING, SCHOLARSHIP, AND SERVICE STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION,
TENURE, AND SALARY-TREATMENT DECISIONS

A. Standards for Performance in Teaching

   Good teaching is the primary obligation of all members of the faculty, and quality
   of teaching must be evaluated rigorously. Faculty members shall ask their
   students in every course taught to evaluate their teaching using the Department
   approved evaluation form.

   1. **Normal performance in teaching** includes but is not limited to:
      
      a. Teaching a standard course load per AY
      b. Advising students competently (e.g. keeping advisees’ General Education
         and major forms updated and accurate each advising period.)
      c. Being available to students during office hours and by appointment
      d. Receiving a plurality (>50%) of A and B grades on student evaluations of
         overall teaching effectiveness
      e. Revising and updating courses periodically as needed to reflect any
         substantive and/or pedagogical changes to class material.
      f. Teaching both upper and lower division classes, including general
         education or Global Leadership classes
      g. Participating in one of the Department’s graduate programs

   2. **Above normal performance in teaching** can be demonstrated by any two of
      the following:
      
      a. Teaching more than the standard number of courses per AY
      b. Receiving an average of 75 to 89% A and B grades on the student
         evaluation of overall teaching effectiveness
c. Developing and teaching a new course, or substantially modifying existing courses to incorporate new materials, teaching methods or delivery methods.

d. Advising several interns, thesis, independent study, honors, GLI capstone projects and/or graduate papers per year.

e. Other above-normal teaching activities indicated by above-average workload, effectiveness, recognition, etc.

3. **Outstanding performance in teaching** can be demonstrated by any two of the following:

   a. Teaching more than the standard number of courses per AY
   b. Receiving an average of 90 to 100% A and B grades on student evaluation of overall teaching effectiveness
   c. Developing and teaching several new courses, or substantially modifying several existing courses to incorporate new materials, teaching methods or delivery methods.
   d. Advising many interns, thesis, independent study, honors, GLI capstone projects, and/or graduate papers per year.
   e. Receiving a teaching and/or advising award
   f. Receiving a teaching and/or advising grant
   g. Other outstanding teaching activities indicated by outstanding workload, effectiveness, recognition, etc.

B. **Standards for Performance in Scholarship**

The Department expects each faculty member to be engaged in an ongoing and maturing research program that ultimately leads to refereed publication. This expectation shall be consistent with resources available for faculty development and travel, but the Department expects each faculty member to be diligent in seeking outside assistance when needed to support that person’s research agenda.

1. The Department has divided scholarly products into two levels according to importance. Scholarly products within levels are not ranked or exhaustive and provide only examples of scholarly activity.

   a. First Level
      1. Authorship of a peer-reviewed book
      2. Co-authorship of a peer-reviewed book
      3. Editing or co-editing a peer-reviewed book of readings in the discipline
      4. Authorship of an article in a peer-reviewed journal
      5. Authorship of a chapter in a peer-reviewed edited work
      6. Major awards and/or grants for scholarly work

   b. Second Level
1. Non-peer-reviewed books, articles, and chapters.
2. Book reviews in professional journals
3. Reprinting of scholarly works previously published
4. Papers presented at professional meetings
5. Consulting or advisory reports
6. Invitations to speak on one’s research at conferences or other academic institutions
7. Non-major awards and/or grants for scholarly work

2. Normal performance in scholarship is defined as having, on average, one scholarly product per year when a tenured/tenure-track faculty member is teaching a standard course load.

3. Above normal performance in scholarship is demonstrated by having one First Level product (except for First Level products that are defined as Outstanding in II.B.2.4 below).

4. Outstanding performance in scholarship is demonstrated by having a peer-reviewed book; or an edited peer-reviewed volume containing one or more significant self-authored chapters; or more than one First Level product; or one high-quality First Level product, indicated for example by press or journal rankings, citations, reviews, major grants, extensive field research, research awards, and/or external evaluations as described in Section I.F.

5. In addition to providing a summary statement of on-going research activity and an accompanying narrative that indicates timeframe for completion of project(s), the faculty record must show evidence of meaningful scholarly activity. Evidence of substantive progress towards completion of the project(s) includes: draft chapters or articles (not submitted in the previous record), a letter requesting a revise and resubmit of the article/manuscript. A letter accepting an article, chapter, or book manuscript for publication is considered evidence of publication.

6. Co-authored and co-edited publications will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, using the same criteria for first- and second-level in II.B.1. and II.B.4, and taking into account the number of co-authors and the faculty’s contribution to the publication.

C. Standards for Performance in Service
The Department stresses the importance of professional service as a component of faculty responsibilities. As evidence of service the following categories apply. No ranking is implied by their arrangement.

1. The Department expects that each faculty member will be engaged in meaningful professional service. The four categories of service include service to the Department, University, community/government, and the profession.
2. **Normal performance in service** is defined as meaningful participation each year, on average, in at least two of the service categories listed above.

3. **Above normal performance in service** is demonstrated by meaningful participation each year, on average, in three of the service categories listed above or meaningful participation in one area and above average effort or quality in another.

4. **Outstanding performance in service** is demonstrated by meaningful participation each year on average, in four service categories, or above average effort or quality in two areas, or outstanding performance in one area, indicated for example by workload, effectiveness, and/or service awards.

D. **Promotion to Associate Professor**

1. Except in unusual circumstances, four or more years of full-time service in rank as Assistant Professor are required prior to the date of promotion to Associate Professor. Application may be made during the fourth year in rank. Completion of the required number of years in rank shall not by itself be grounds for promotion.

2. A merit is not required for attaining promotion or tenure; however, consistent normal performance in scholarship during the period of years under review shall not be sufficient for promotion or tenure.

3. Promotion to Associate Professor shall be recommended by the FEC and departmental chairperson if the faculty member has:
   
   a. At least above normal performance in scholarship over the years in rank, defined as at least one scholarly product per year on average, of which two must be First Level (as defined in Section II.B.1) or one must be a peer-reviewed book, or a peer-reviewed edited volume containing one or more significant self-authored chapters, or a high-quality First Level product (as defined in Section II.B.4).

   b. At least above normal performance in either teaching or service over the time in rank as explained in Sections II.A and II.C above.

   c. At least normal performance the other area (teaching or service) over the time in rank.

4. The review period shall cover the applicant’s cumulative performance during his/her years in rank. Particular attention will be given to the most recent years of the faculty’s record.
5. Documentation in the IPR shall cover every year of service in the current rank.

E. The Tenure Decision

1. Faculty members who possess five years of credit toward tenure (no more than three years of which may be credited from another institution), a terminal degree in the discipline, and the academic rank of Associate Professor may apply for tenure in the sixth probationary year. A faculty member may seek tenure and promotion to Associate Professor simultaneously.

2. Tenure shall be recommended by the FEC and departmental chairperson if the faculty member has:

   a. At least above normal performance in scholarship over the probationary period, defined as meeting the Standards for promotion to Associate as defined in II.D.3 plus one additional First-level product. Alternatively, a high-quality book used to attain promotion to Associate is also sufficient for tenure.

   b. At least above normal performance in either teaching or service over the entire probationary period.

   c. At least normal performance the other area (teaching or service) over the probationary period.

F. Promotion to Professor

1. Except in unusual circumstances, five or more years of full-time service in rank as an Associate Professor are required prior to the date of promotion to Professor (application may be made during the fifth year). The character of the service in rank shall be such that there is a clear demonstration of professional growth and an increasingly valuable contribution to the University. Completion of the required number of years in rank shall not by itself be grounds for promotion.

2. The review period and documentation shall cover the applicant’s cumulative performance during his/her years in rank or since the documentation was prepared for the last promotion, or the most recent seven sequential years.

3. Promotion to Professor shall be recommended by the FEC and departmental chairperson if the faculty member has:

   a. At least above normal performance in scholarship over the review period, defined as at least one scholarly product per year on average, of which three must be First Level (as defined in Section II.B.1) or one
must be a self- or co-authored peer-reviewed book; or a self- or co-authored peer-reviewed edited volume containing one or more significant self-authored chapters; or a high-quality First Level product (as defined in Section II.B.4).

b. At least above normal performance in either teaching or service over the entire time in rank or the most recent five years, as explained in Sections II.A and C above.

c. At least normal performance the other area (teaching or service) over the time in rank or the most recent five years.

G. The Merit Decision

1. A merit recommendation shall be based on above-normal performance in at least two of the three areas (teaching, scholarship, service) and normal performance in the third area, or normal performance in at least two areas and outstanding performance in at least one area, using the procedures and with reference to the teaching, scholarship, and service standards set out above.

2. Documentation shall be as prescribed in the CBA.

H. The Less-Than-Normal Decision

1. A recommendation for a less-than-normal salary increase is appropriate for unsatisfactory performance in one or more of the three categories of teaching, scholarship, and service using the above procedures and standards, if performance in the other category or categories is normal.

2. Documentation shall be as prescribed in the CBA.

III. NON-REAPPOINTMENT RECOMMENDATION

Non-retention recommendation for probationary appointees shall be made pursuant to the procedures presented above and pursuant to the CBA.

IV. NON-TENURABLE FACULTY

Non-tenurable appointees shall be evaluated according to the standards in Section II, but each appointee shall be evaluated only in those areas of performance stipulated by the terms of his or her appointment. For example, non-tenurable appointees may or may not be required to perform advising, to engage in departmental or university service. Contributions in areas that lie outside assigned duties are to be noted in the FEC evaluation only for the purpose of providing special recognition and are not a required element of the evaluation.
V. AMENDMENT

A. Any tenured or tenure-track faculty of the Department of Political Science may request a meeting of the Department to consider changing these standards and procedures.

B. Prior to their use in the evaluation process, amendments require majority approval of the full-time, tenured and tenured-track faculty of the Department and approval of the University Unit Standards Committee, the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, and the Provost.

C. The FEC and Department Chairperson view the standards elucidated above as guidelines for evaluating faculty performance designed, above all, to encourage meaningful professional creativity and growth of all individual faculty. Mindful of this, the FEC and Department Chairperson recognize that there may arise situations in which a faculty member makes a reasonable case for something not foreseen by the standards. In such cases, FEC and Department Chairperson will assess any "atypical" faculty records based upon all relevant information it has available.

VI. EVALUATION OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON

A. The FEC shall review annually the effectiveness of the performance of the Department chairperson. The results of their evaluation will be included in the chairperson’s next regular evaluation.

B. Views of all other Departmental faculty members shall be solicited and considered in the evaluation of the chairperson. The chairperson shall have a right of response.

C. The chair of the FEC shall prepare an evaluation that represents the consensus of the FEC and transmit it to the dean.

D. Criteria for evaluation of the chairperson shall include leadership, encouragement and support of faculty efforts, openness in communications and decision making, and administrative competence and efficiency.

E. The administrative performance of the departmental chairperson is subject to review at any time by the CAS dean.