

## **Department of Political Science Performance Standards (as of Summer, 2014)**

### **Prefatory comments:**

We accept the College Standards as general, cross-disciplinary standards. However, we make the following clarifications and caveats:

We take note that the principal mission of this university – and this department - is teaching. This is clearly and repeatedly stated in numerous forms and venues. As such, this department places greatest emphasis on superior teaching. We also note, though, that the university fully recognizes the value and the expectation of scholarly work. We agree with this and recognize that teaching and scholarship are necessarily interrelated. We also think that our faculty have a responsibility to give their time to other activities and endeavors which are collectively called "service." We also note that this Department is relatively small, and so therefore the expectations of faculty in these three areas should reflect that fact - and the stated mission of Political Science (see “Mission and Goals” statements elsewhere).

We feel it's important, however, in our own efforts to establish standards and criteria for retention, promotion, tenure, and post tenure-review, to acknowledge that "one size doesn't fit all." We will take into account the fact that different faculty have different strengths. Still, teaching is paramount while both scholarship and service are expected and required, and in no case will unsatisfactory levels of activity and performance in one of the three areas compensate for higher levels in the other two.

**I. Teaching.** Teaching is the most important of the three areas of evaluation, but outstanding teaching in the absence of satisfactory contributions in the other two areas will be inadequate. It is noted that, as acknowledged in the COTS Policy Manual, teaching can take forms other than in-class instruction; for example, mentoring students in undergraduate research or “civic engagement,” such as internships and relevant service-learning projects.

#### **A. Methods/Instruments**

1. SEOIs will be administered to all classes with five or more students, or whatever the basis is used by the Office of Testing. Every effort must be made to obtain evaluations from all enrolled students. All instructors are encouraged to encourage their students to complete course evaluations; however, given responses are online and voluntary, that cannot be assured as we note below, response rates should be taken into consideration.
2. In addition to the SEOI, the department administers an evaluation-questionnaire to graduating political science majors and the Master of Science in Public Administration (MS-PA) students – comments relating to individual faculty, while not directly solicited, will be noted in reviews.

3. All faculty who are up for annual renewal, retention, promotion or tenure are required to receive peer visitations and be provided with constructive feedback at least once a year. For tenured faculty with Full Professor rank, at least one peer visitation review during the post-tenure review time period, not necessarily annual one, will be necessary to be put in their personal portfolio. There will also be a qualitative review of syllabi and course materials that will accompany peer visitation. The department will employ its own, standard reporting and documentation practices for this purpose. Faculty will be given reasonable advance notice of such visitations and other peer review processes.
4. Faculty members' course materials and any other relevant pedagogical materials will be collected, separate from other personnel information, in a teaching portfolio. This will include syllabi (*complete* syllabi), copies of examinations and other assignments, evidence of any innovations, SEOI summary results, and any other materials pertinent to faculty members' teaching responsibilities. Summaries of the end-of-major student questionnaires will be placed in a separate file, but in the same location as the portfolios. Faculty who fail to cooperate and maintain updated teaching materials in their file will have that fact noted in their personnel review letters.

## **B. Evaluation**

1. At least one meeting a year will take place between probationary faculty and members of the Department Personnel Committee to discuss teaching performance. The Department Chair has, however, the prime responsibility to communicate with the probationary faculty regarding her/his professional performance for improvement. In addition, all eligible department members will take care to utilize all the methods and instruments in (A) above in evaluating the probationary member for reappointment. In these cases, the purpose is principally to call attention to any concerns and to assist the faculty member in resolving those concerns.
2. *On the current survey*, quantitative scores ranging from 4.00 to 5.00 (or their equivalent) will be regarded as satisfactory and the basic department "standard" for the vast majority of questions. Figures which fall below 4.00, if persistent, may be regarded as unsatisfactory. Students' written comments will be given heavy weight, although *patterns over time* are important, not the occasional negative comments. Faculty will take into account specific classroom circumstances; for example, the number of students in the class, whether the course is introductory or upper-level, whether the course is in a field of emphasis for the instructor, and any other factors which might culturally affect the student-instructor relationship (e.g, demographic attributes of the faculty, expected grade in the course, etc). Most importantly, the *response rate* given voluntary, online administration of these surveys (assuming this is still done) will be examined. Courses with low response rates (below 40 percent) will not be

completely discounted, but will carry less weight than those with about half or more.

3. Similarly, consistent patterns, both positive and negative, on the end-of-major questionnaire are important, not occasional negative or positive comments. Student evaluations here will be regarded as particularly important.
4. In the evaluation of faculty for reappointment, promotion, tenure, merit, and post-tenure review, it is the responsibility of each department member to fully utilize all of the materials described in (A.4) above.
5. Every effort will be made to assist faculty whose teaching performance consistently falls below these levels, but if improvement doesn't become manifest, the faculty member will be denied reappointment, promotion, tenure or post-tenure review as is appropriate, and may result in negative performance evaluations for tenured members.

**II. Scholarship.** Scholarly activity is essential. It is in this area that faculty demonstrate that they are intellectually alive, and the products of that intellectual activity are disseminated to the scholarly community and to society outside the confines of the university. *The University recognizes two distinct categories of scholarly work: "A," which are peer-reviewed, professional distinctions and "B," others that are of relevant, but not as rigorous or significant, stature.*

**A. Examples:**

1. First Tier, "Category A" Accomplishments include:

- Publish a scholarly, peer-reviewed (blind or equivalent) book\*
- Publish article in a refereed journal, sole author\*
- Publish book chapter (unless invited)\*
- Publish a book, co-author\*
- Publish article in a refereed journal or book anthology, co-author\*
- Research monographs
- Publish a textbook
- Publish peer-reviewed conference articles and proceedings (the entire manuscript is subject to peer review)
- Receipt of grants (the principal investigator or co-principal investigators) or fellowship from nationally or internationally recognized agency or foundation via peer-review award criteria process (e.g., NSF, NIH, DOE, NEH, NEA, The Fulbright, The John D. & Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, The Congressional fellowship, etc.)
- Other outputs Department approves

\*We recognize that such products must meet the criteria of *legitimate peer review* (for our field, generally double-blind peer, but at least some degree of independent editorial judgment and not "automatic publication" in proceedings or the like, including "predatory" or "pay to play" outlets as

noted in the College guidelines. Not all publications that require payment are illegitimate, as the College also recognizes through the use of CoTS funds for page charges, for example. Faculty must make the case and provide evidence that any such publications should be counted as "A."

2. Second Tier, "Category B"

- Present a paper at a professional conference (International or national conference presentation will be more valued than regional and local conference papers)
- Present poster presentations at a professional conference and invited talks
- Receive an internal grant
- Apply for an external grant
- Publish a chapter in a textbook or edited volume for student use
- Edit a scholarly book, or a professional journal
- Publish test banks, study guides, and pedagogical resources subjected to editorial review
- Publish a solicited or non-refereed article
- Publish an encyclopedia entry or reference work
- Publish a book review
- Web publication, non-refereed
- Other outputs Department approves

**B. Evaluation**

1. We reject a purely quantitative approach to the evaluation of faculty scholarly activity. Not all journals are equal; not all articles are of equal value. Repeated presentations of the same convention paper, for example, will "count" for only one paper. This department is small enough for each of us to examine members' examples of scholarly activity and make qualitative judgments when considering reappointment, promotion, and tenure.
2. As a general rule, though, the groupings of scholarly activities found in [A] above reflect in descending order the significance of the contribution. The impact(s) of the contribution will also be taken into consideration, such as citation(s) or re-publication in other venues.
3. This department requires scholarly productivity at the level, nature and in the time frame specified in the COTS Policy Manual. Our main criteria of acceptability, however, are quality, the significance of the contribution, and the extent of public exposure to the contribution. For example, one might publish a brief article in an obscure journal in a two-year period of time, but this won't necessarily carry as much weight as someone else who produces a more significant article in a widely-read publication in a three-year period, and who also has presented a separate paper at an international or national professional meeting. During the probationary, pre-tenure period *at CWU*, at a minimum the department expects more than one completed, externally-validated product(s) within the first tier, and additional ones in the lower tiers, which are either in progress toward

those in the first tier or are independent products in their own right. For promotion, faculty should likewise demonstrate continued, completed, and successful scholarly activity. For post-tenure review, the department expects that faculty should sustain scholarly engagement, within the accepted guidelines of their workload during the relevant period.

4. All forms of scholarly activity must be placed in the department personnel files.

**III. Service.** Service refers to activities which have a voluntary aspect not found in Teaching and Scholarship. Typically, such activities involve contributing one's time and energy to the university, to the local community, to wider audiences, and to one's own profession. We expect faculty members to perform both university and external community service in some form during any particular review period, though we recognize there may be variation depending upon the balance faculty choose to strike among the three areas in their workloads.

**A. Examples,** not necessarily exhaustive and in no particular order

1. CWU committee service
2. Participation on local, state, national, or international, professional or political/government boards
3. Public lectures on-campus
4. Public lectures off-campus
5. Organize public colloquia
6. Faculty Senate membership
7. Edit a journal (non-professional)
8. Review manuscripts for a journal
9. Department chair
10. Program director
11. Serve as an officer in a professional organization
12. Faculty adviser for student organizations
13. Contributions to the department; department committees
14. Publication in non-refereed popular media
15. Panel discussant or chair at a professional meeting
16. Media interviews

**B. Evaluation**

1. Evaluating service is often more difficult than other types of faculty activity, and it is incumbent on faculty to make a case as to their role and degree of service. Clearly, however, some types are more valuable than others (service to a large, international organization v. a local one; department chair v. a public lecture; etc.), though more important is that service is rendered. As a general guideline, though, we expect faculty to participate in university governance which typically takes the form of service on committees, permanent and ad hoc. We further expect faculty to contribute their professional expertise to local audiences, and in general to make themselves available as sources of information and knowledge. As political scientists, public service is integral to our field and mission.

We believe that service to the larger community is part of the departmental and university missions. If a faculty member fails to, in effect, "get out of the department" in some of the ways indicated, this may be regarded as a serious obstacle to reappointment, promotion, tenure, or "continuation without reservation" in the case of post-tenure review.

2. Those faculty seeking promotion to associate professor should demonstrate some relevant departmental, as well as university and public, service. Tenured faculty should show more involvement with university and public service, especially towards the department, in any review period. With Departmental service, there should be regular rotation and participation. The same people should not continually serve as committee or department chairs, Faculty Senator, etc.
3. Service should be recognized through the workload plan, and the department suggests the following guidelines: Chair of Dept. Committees: 2 WLUs; Membership on Dept. Committees: 1 WLU; Chair of Search Committees: 2 WLUs; Membership on Dept. Search Committees: 1 WLU. For University level committee work, follow the University and COTS Policy Manual.
4. Evidence of service activities should be provided in the workload planning and activities report databases. Furthermore, documentation of activities (letters or tokens of recognition, materials listing or showing activities, etc.) should be included in the personnel file.

#### **IV. Collegiality**

As a relatively small department, we place a high value on collegiality and traditionally have had a high degree of *esprit de corps*.

##### **A. Definition and Role**

1. Admittedly, defining "collegiality" it is difficult. And, the AAUP notes that it should be encapsulated under the above three categories of faculty work. However, we think it important and distinctive enough to mention it separately here, since there may be some areas where it is not, for example, embodied in "departmental service" narrowly defined.

2. Despite these difficulties, we think it clearly means constructively rather than destructively interacting with departmental colleagues. As Former Speaker of the US House Sam Rayburn once said, "if you want to get along, go along." Thus, collegiality in terms of working together, treating each other with mutual respect, and aiding colleagues and the department to be successful in our goals and professional life, is an expected part of the job; and at the extreme, the antithesis of these qualities undermines all of them.

3. We would further note that collegiality refers only to professionally relevant areas related to faculty roles within the Department, and not to personal likes and dislikes, or whether someone has the same sense of humor, etc. Similarly, academic and political freedom is at the core of our discipline, and independent views and disagreements can serve a useful function. Therefore, "collegiality" *does not include* agreeing with one's political views – inside or outside the academy - or adherence to some kind of monolithic "political correctness" within the Department.

## **B. Evaluation**

Clearly, there is some subjectivity in evaluating the degree to which someone is a “good colleague.” And we note, here, that such evaluations carry less weight than performance in the above three areas, or should be related to same. However, it should be clear if a member of the department is, through their individual behavior, demeanor or actions, negatively impacting the professional operation of the Department.

1. Assessments of faculty collegiality should be communicated with candidates for reappointment, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review openly and *be based on legitimate, university, departmental and professional activities.*

2. Any such perceived “deficiencies” must be stated clearly *in writing* in performance reviews and every effort made to allow faculty members to address the issues.

3. Extreme lack of collegiality may be grounds for less-than-laudatory performance evaluations.

## **V. Other Criteria or Categories.**

**A. Merit/Performance Above Expectation.** Under the current CBA guidelines, full professors undergoing post-tenure review are eligible for merit in the areas of teaching and/or research. To be eligible in the area of teaching, a full professor must show a record above what is expected for rank – i.e., excellent performance in the evaluations of teaching plus some other measure (e.g., creation and successful offering of a new class; teaching awards; recognized pedagogy or pedagogical scholarship; alumni recognition; etc.) For scholarship, again the candidate must exceed that required to obtain full professor status, such as: 3 or more category “A” publications; major external grants; publication within top or highly competitive/difficult outlets (those with very low acceptance rates or high prestige within the field); external recognition of scholarly excellence or achievement; etc. It is up to the candidate to demonstrate these characteristics.

For Chairs, they must demonstrate outstanding performance in their duties as Chair as well as meet at least one of the above standards. The Political Science Department supports Chair evaluation criteria of the COTS Policy Manual. However as the Department Chair’s workload has tremendously increased recently, the Department will consider Chair’s workload in the overall evaluation of Chair duties.

**B. Phased retirees.** Similar standards and procedures will be developed for phased retirees, in the event this is possible again under future versions of the CBA.

## **VI. Process**

**A. Conformance with Collective Bargaining:** The processes and procedures used in faculty evaluation, whether specified above or not, will conform to the most recent, currently approved version of the Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement.