

Department of Political Science Performance Standards (2019)

Introduction:

In addition to the standards established by COTS, the Political Science Department would also note that as a teaching institution, we place greater emphasis on the contributions our faculty members make in the classroom and enhancing the education experience of our students. Research and service obligations should not be neglected, but the priority should be on teaching.

In what follows we establish our standards and criteria for promotion, tenure and post tenure review. While teaching is paramount, 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 be compensated for by higher levels in the other two.

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.

Methods/Instruments:

Teaching will be assessed through both quantitative and qualitative indicators. This includes SEOIs, peer evaluation (classroom visits, syllabus evaluation, peer to peer discussions), and student evaluations administered in the senior assessment class. While instructors should encourage their students to complete SEOIs we are aware the response rates are often inadequate due to the voluntary nature of the online process. The department is more interested in general patterns from SEOIs and the senior assessment survey.

Each faculty member is required to upload relevant teaching materials (syllabi, evaluations, etc.) to Faculty180. If the materials are not uploaded to Faculty180, an accurate review of the faculty member’s teaching cannot be conducted. Relevant teaching materials will include self-reflection and chair/supervisor evaluation consistent with the “Guidelines for the Evaluation of Teaching” prepared by the Faculty Senate Evaluation and Assessment Committee (2012)

Faculty members are entitled to have a peer review done by the department personnel committee chair every year. The chair of the department personnel committee will visit with the faculty member, attend a class session and write up a peer review. The evaluation will be given to the department chair and posted to Faculty180.¹ The peer review will be consistent with the “Report to the Faculty Senate on Peer Review of Teaching” prepared by the Faculty Senate Evaluation and Assessment Committee (2012).

¹ The department personnel committee chair will receive 2 workload units to complete these peer evaluations and other responsibilities inherent in the position.

Evaluation of Teaching:

1. On the current SEOI survey, the department's expectation for all faculty members is that a majority of the quantitative scores for individual questions on the survey from classes taught should be over a 4.0.
2. SEOI scores will be considered together with other indicators of effectiveness, including peer observation and self-reflection.
3. Students written comments on SEOIs will be considered if they articulate a reasonable concern. (For example, student comments noting that a faculty member never graded exams or graded exams four weeks late.) Student comments that are inappropriate or immature will not be given any consideration. (Student comments that are racist, sexist, homophobic or derogatory are irrelevant to our evaluation process.) We will evaluate faculty members based on consistent patterns and not one or two negative comments on a SEOI.
4. Similarly, consistent patterns, both positive and negative, on the end-of-major questionnaire and in peer evaluations are important, not occasional negative or positive comments.
5. Every effort will be made to assist faculty whose teaching performance consistently falls below these levels. These efforts include additional peer evaluations by department chair or department personnel chair. 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.
6. Faculty members at any level can also submit mid-quarter evaluations that the faculty member has undertaken to demonstrate improvement and commitment to teaching.
7. *Assistant Professor*: 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 his/her professional performance for improvement. The purpose of these discussions is to address and concerns that have developed and to assist the faculty member in resolving those concerns. In addition, in the third year, an evaluation will be administered for 5 of the individual's classes by the department secretary. This evaluation will be conducted to get a more complete understanding of the individual's approach to teaching and effectiveness in the classroom. These evaluations will be added to Faculty180.
8. *Associate Professor*: In the third or fourth year after promotion, an evaluation will be administered for 5 of the individual's classes by the department secretary. This evaluation will be conducted to get more complete understanding of the individual's effectiveness in the classroom. These evaluations will be added to Faculty180
9. *Full Professor*: In the third or fourth year after promotion, an evaluation will be administered for 5 of the individual's classes by the department secretary. This evaluation will be conducted to get more complete understanding of the individual's effectiveness in the classroom. These evaluations will be added to Faculty180

Scholarship:

We expect faculty members to produce academic scholarship related to the field of political science that contributes to the scholarly community and to society outside the confines of the university. Scholarship can take various forms. *The University recognizes two distinct categories of scholarly work: "A" which are peer-reviewed, professional distinctions and "B" others that are relevant, but not as rigorous in stature and do not involve as rigorous a review process.*

Category “A” Accomplishments²

1. Publication of a scholarly, peer-reviewed (blind) book (sole author)
2. Publication of an article in a peer-reviewed academic journal (sole author)
3. Publication of a book chapter in a peer-reviewed book (sole author)
4. Publication of a peer-reviewed book (co-author)
5. Publication of an article in a peer-reviewed academic journal (co-author)
6. Publication of a textbook
7. Publication of a peer-reviewed conference proceedings³
8. Funded peer-reviewed external grant (principal investigator or co-principal investigator) of fellowship from nationally or internationally recognized agency or foundation (via a peer-review process)
9. Other accomplishments that are approved by the department and documented on the individual’s workload plan⁴

Category “B” Accomplishments

1. Presentation of a scholarly paper at a professional conference or workshop. (International or national conference presentation will be more valued than regional and local conference papers).
2. Presentation of a poster at a professional conference
3. Presentation of scholarship via an invited talk (national or international venue)
4. Publication of a book review in a peer-reviewed journal
5. Funded internal grant
6. Publication of a solicited or non-refereed article
7. Publication of an encyclopedia essay or report
8. Apply for an external grant that is not funded.
9. Other accomplishment that are approved by the department and documented on the individual’s workload plan.⁵

² We are referring to legitimate peer reviewed products and not by predatory publishers. A double, blind peer review process is the standard in our field. We do not have concern about paying for reasonable expenses such as creating an index or page charges in legitimate peer-reviews open access venues. This is consistent with COTS Manual 7.1.2.1.2. “With ongoing proliferation of predatory journals, open source journals, online journals, and print-on-demand book publishers, it is not always a simple matter to tell what venues are “widely recognized as being subject to formal and rigorous peer-reviewed processes and disseminated outside the university” as called for in 7.1.2.1. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1xv148c8>

³ The paper presented is subject to a peer review process prior to publication.

⁴ We recognize that some publications may not fit into one of the previous categories. We will allow for a research product to be included as a Category “A” accomplishment if it has been approved by the department personnel committee and documented on Faculty180

⁵ We recognize that some publications may not fit into one of the previous categories. We will allow for a research product to be included as a Category “B” accomplishment if it has been approved by the department personnel committee and documented on Faculty180.

Evaluation:

The Political Science Department requires faculty members to produce quality scholarly products. During their time of residence at Central Washington University, the department requires at least two peer-reviewed products in Category “A” and at least one additional product in Category “B”. At least one category A product must be fully initiated and completed while at CWU. For faculty member seeking promotion from Associate to Full, faculty members should demonstrate continued, completed, and successful scholarly activity. This requires three additional Category “A” products and at least one Category “B” product. For post-tenure review, faculty members should continue to maintain their scholarly engagement with at least one Category “A” and one Category “B” product. These standards should be developed and consistent with the faculty member’s workload plan. Any deviation from these standards must be justified in the faculty member’s workload plan.

The impact of the contribution (for example, citations in in other venues, reprints, impact on public policy, etc.) will be taken into consideration.⁶

All scholarly products must be uploaded to Faculty180 to be considered for promotion, reappointment, and post tenure review.

Service:

Service refers to activities which contribute to the university, local, national or international community. We expect faculty members to perform both university and external community service in some form during any particular review period and these activities should be demonstrated in their workloads.

Examples of acceptable service activities that will be recognized and evaluated:

1. CWU committee
2. Department committee (chair or member)
3. Public lectures (on or off campus)
4. Faculty Senate
5. Department Chair
6. CWU program director
7. Faculty advisor for student organization on campus
8. Editor of a journal or reviewer of manuscripts for a publisher
9. Panel discussant or chair at a professional meeting
10. Media interviews
11. Participation on local, state, national, or international, professional or political/government board
12. Serve as an office in a professional organization or community project⁷

⁶ Presenting the same paper at numerous conferences will be considered one scholarly product regardless of how many conferences a faculty member attends.

⁷ Additional activities may count as service if approved by the chair of the department and included in the faculty member’s workload plan.

Evaluation:

Faculty members are expected to participate in a range of service activities during the probationary period and as tenured member of the department. 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 expect faculty members to fulfill the basic requirements of the service (attend meetings, contribute to discussions, etc.). We encourage faculty to contribute their professional expertise to local audiences, and in general to make themselves available as sources of information and knowledge.

It is incumbent on faculty to make a case as to their role and degree of service. Evidence should be uploaded to Faculty180 (for example, letters indicating role and service on a committee, meeting reports and other relevant forms of verification which indicate a faculty member's service contributions.).

During the probationary period/pre-tenure period, a faculty member should participate in at least one college or university committee, advise a couple of majors, and contribute to department functions (development of policies where applicable or other specific accomplishments as developed in coordination with the department personnel committee).

For promotion to full professor, excellence in service is defined as significant leadership or contribution to professional, department, or campus community that is documented.

Collegiality:

Defining 'collegiality' can be difficult. We think it clearly means constructively, rather than destructively interacting with members of the department, students, and other individuals on campus. A lack of collegiality is evident when an individual engages in sexist, racist, homophobic language or activities. We will follow the standards on collegiality in COTS Manual under section 7.1.

Senior Lecturer:

Individuals seeking promotion to senior lecturer will be evaluated consistent with the standards established by COTS. Effective teaching as noted in an earlier section of this document is required.

Merit:

In order to be considered for merit adjustment, a senior lecturer must continue to meet the teaching standards set out by COTS.

In order to be considered for merit adjustment, a full professor must fulfill the basic duties as set out in the individual's workload plan. Beyond those basic duties there are additional requirements for teaching, research and service.

Excellent teaching is required. Following the COTS Manual under section 7.1.1.2., excellent teaching is demonstrated through "several sources of evidence, such as: a sustained pattern of positive SEOI results, demonstrated both numerically and through student comments, teaching awards, published pedagogical scholarship, student and peer reviews/testimonials, a pattern of significant academic progress or career achievement by students, curriculum development, and/or similar evidence of commendable accomplishments in teaching." Three Category "A" products and two Category "B" products are required

for research. Excellent service is required. Following the COTS Manual under 7.1.3.4.4., excellent service requires the faculty member to have “continued to meet department, college and university criteria” which involved “sustained contributions to university life and increasing service to professional organizations and/or the community for promotion to full professor.”⁸

Approvals:




Chair, Department of Political Science

Oct 25, 2019
Date



Dean, College of the Sciences

10/25/19
Date



Provost and Vice President for Academic and Student Life

11.1.19
Date

⁸ This is the language used in the COTS Manual under 7.1.3.4.3.