

**DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE**

**ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES**

**(Approved by Faculty Vote on 5/07/2010)**

**PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES**

**(Approved by Faculty Vote on 5/07/2010)**

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES \*(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): **5/2015**

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES\*: **5/2015**

**Jeff Pickering, Department Head**

**Date signed: 5/07/2010**

**Brian Spooner, Interim Dean**

**Date signed: 5/10/2010**

**April C. Mason, Provost and Senior Vice President**

**Date signed: 5/16/2010**

*\*Each academic department is required by University Handbook policy to develop department documents containing criteria, standards, and guidelines for promotion, tenure, reappointment, annual evaluation and merit salary allocation. These documents must be approved by a majority vote of the faculty members in the department, by the department head or chair, by the dean concerned, and by the provost. In accordance with University Handbook policy, provision must be made to review these documents at least once every five years or more frequently if it is determined to be necessary. Dates of revision (or the vote to continue without revision) must appear on the first page of the document.*

## **DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE**

### **Annual Faculty Evaluations<sup>1</sup>**

#### **Introduction**

This statement provides a summary of current departmental practices regarding the various forms of faculty evaluation. The practices and procedures noted in this document apply to intra-departmental personnel processes. All of these practices and procedures fall within spirit of the University Handbook.<sup>2</sup> It is anticipated that modifications may be made in these practices and procedures as a result of departmental planning and review and/or changes in the University Handbook.

#### **Annual Merit Evaluation**

1. Annual merit evaluations of faculty performance are designed both to provide feedback to faculty and to provide a fair and objective basis for the allocation of merit salary increases.
2. The primary source of evidence for the evaluation is the information provided by the faculty members being evaluated. Near the end of each calendar year (typically in late November or early December), the faculty are requested to submit information concerning their instructional activities (including teaching, advising, and participation on graduate committees), research, and service. Faculty will normally submit all teaching evaluations and TEVAL summaries for each of the courses they have taught during the year. In addition, syllabi, tests, unsolicited student comments, and other evidence of instructional performance are welcomed. Copies of publications, professional papers, and other evidence of scholarly performance should also be submitted. Attached is a copy of the request for information and the format of submissions.
3. Faculty members will submit materials that will be initially reviewed by a three member faculty evaluation committee.
4. The Faculty Evaluation Committee, whose recommendations are advisory to the department head, is chosen annually on a rotating basis. Whenever possible the committee should include a full professor, an associate professor, and an assistant professor. Usually, one member is carried over from the previous year to serve as chair of the committee and is joined by two new additional members. Although faculty may opt not to serve, all faculty are encouraged to serve when selected. The FEC members may confer with one another, but submit separate evaluations to the chair of the committee who summarizes their evaluations to the department head, in each case excluding herself or himself. The FEC is to evaluate each faculty member based on a rating scale of Outstanding, Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, and Unacceptable. This rating excludes

---

<sup>1</sup> Revised Evaluation and Tenure and Promotion Procedures accepted by department on May 7, 2010. The department accepted previous versions of this document in 1992, 1995, 2003, and 2007.

<sup>2</sup> Personnel files made available by faculty to the department for the purposes of evaluation are assumed to be confidential. Likewise, conversations in committees regarding all personnel files are considered confidential. Documents that are already publicly available, like vitas, course syllabi, publications, committee assignments, are not considered confidential. Finally, the University Handbook specifies other faculty rights, appeals and grievance procedures, which are beyond the scope of this document. Copies of the most recent version of the University Handbook can be found on K-State's web site.

any combination of two different ratings such as Good/Very Good, Very Good/Excellent, or Excellent/Outstanding. In the instance of a faculty member who cannot be evaluated by the department head, the committee members report their assessments directly to the Dean of Arts and Sciences or to the person designated by the dean to serve in that evaluative capacity.

5. Review and Rating by Department Head: After the head independently reviews the faculty evaluations and considers the recommendation of the FEC members, he/she determines faculty ratings based on a scale of Outstanding, Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, and Unacceptable. This rating excludes any combination of two different ratings such as Good/Very Good, Very Good/Excellent, or Excellent/Outstanding. Each component of performance (instruction, research, service) is rated independently and a composite rating is also given. The allocation of an individual faculty member's rating is entirely independent of the ratings of other faculty members. In other words, it is theoretically possible for all the faculty to be outstanding or, conversely, for all to be unacceptable, or for any other distribution to occur between these two polar possibilities.
6. Communications between the FEC and the Department Head: Prior to the head's presenting his/her written evaluation statement to each faculty member, the head and FEC will share and discuss their initial evaluations of each faculty member. Based on the FEC's additional input, the head may choose to revise his/her initial evaluation of a faculty member.
7. Draft Statements and Consultation with Faculty: The department head prepares a draft statement for each faculty member. The statement summarizes the year's activities and includes the ratings assigned. These statements are shared with the faculty individually and corrections and comments are invited. Faculty are requested to discuss the evaluation with the department head. After such opportunities for consultation the evaluation statements are finalized. Faculty initial or sign one copy to acknowledge receipt. If there is disagreement with the statement, a dissenting statement may be submitted. The full set of statements is then submitted to the dean with a cover letter from the department head.
8. Nominees for Special Honors (Teaching and Advising): The department head must consult with the FEC concerning nominees for teaching awards or other honors which might be related to faculty evaluation. Candidates for special awards should have taught at least two courses each of the preceding two semesters. Criteria for nominations are included in the department's *Evaluation, Tenure and Promotion: Procedures, Standards and Criteria*.
9. Recommendations for Merit Salary Increases: When salary recommendations are invited by the Dean of Arts and Sciences, the department head distributes increases in relationship to faculty ratings. All faculty who have done a satisfactory job are provided at least a minimal salary increase.
10. Recommendations for Equity Adjustments: When equity adjustment funds are available, the department head recommends one or more individuals for equity adjustment increases based on both merit and peer universities' salaries. The head informs all faculty and invites them to submit statements indicating why they should be considered for equity increases. The department head consults the FEC in his equity calculations and makes final recommendations.

## EVALUATION GUIDELINES

### Department of Political Science

To assist the department head in arriving at a fair and accurate assessment of faculty members' performance, the Faculty Evaluation Committee is requesting information pertaining to each faculty member's instructional activities and load, research and professional activities, department and university service and public service.

For the sake of comparability, this information, which will be used to determine merit salary adjustments and promotions, should be presented in the following manner:

- 1 Your name and rank
- 2 An updated vita
- 3 Instruction: Instruction encompasses classroom instruction, student advising, and graduate student supervision. All three are important in the evaluation process. Information relevant to performance in this area must include the following items:
  - a. Classroom Instruction:
    - i. **Course Load:** Please list courses taught (number, course title, and approximate number of students in each) during this calendar year (spring and fall). If you did not teach five courses, please explain why not.
    - ii. **Teaching Performance:** Please attach the results of all individual and summary TEVAL course evaluations for each class taught this calendar year (spring and fall). Also attach additional evidence of teaching performance, which may include past student surveys, additional student surveys taken, syllabi, or anything else you feel sheds light on your teaching. See Effective Faculty Evaluation Manual, (pp. 8-9), for suggestions.
  - b. **Student Advising:** Identify the number of undergraduate students you advise and specify the nature of your relationship with them (i.e., do they come in once a semester, or are you in more frequent contact with them). What percentage of your time is devoted to undergraduate advising?
  - c. Graduate Student Supervision:
    - i. List the graduate students who have completed their M.A. or M.P.A. under your direction this calendar year.
    - ii. List the graduate students currently enrolled under your guidance.
    - iii. List service on M.A. or M.P.A. committees where you are/were not the principal advisor in this and other departments, and Ph.D. committees in other departments for this calendar year. List names and departments; specify M.A., M.P.A., or Ph.D.

- 4 Research/Professional Service: This includes material published during the calendar year or accepted for publication, work in progress or part of a large project, papers before professional societies, panel member, chairperson or panel, journal reviewer, member of professional board, etc.
  - a. **Publications During Calendar Year:** Please list publications and indicate whether they are in a professional journal (**J**), monograph (**M**), popular article (**P**), book (**B**), book review (**BR**), or other (**O**). Please provide a few details about these publications – for example, whether the articles were refereed, and something of the nature of the journal/magazine, if it is not one of the common professional ones. Please make certain that copies of these publications are included in your departmental open file (publications and vita).
  - b. **Work in Progress:** Identify work in progress and indicate how it fits into ongoing projects. Please include copies of papers written, book chapters, tables of contents, and the like.
  - c. **Professional Activities:** List all professional activities carried out during the calendar year: papers given, panel member or chair, board member, books or manuscripts reviewed.
  
- 5 Department/University Service: This includes service on departmental and university committees, special assignments undertaken, and other services rendered to the department or university.
  - a. Please list university and departmental committees on which you have served during this calendar year.
  - b. List other services performed for the university community.
  
- 6 Public Service: This involves services to the larger community reflecting not only professional expertise but service to the community as well.
  
- 7 Additional Considerations: Please indicate any additional information you feel is relevant to the proper assessment of your overall performance. This may include providing information about past projects, those about to come to fruition, long-term projects, such as administrative roles and phase retirement or extenuating circumstances.
  
- 8 The following percentages are given as an indication of the general expectations of the department concerning the importance of each area of performance:

<u>Area</u>	<u>Minimum or Maximum %</u>	
Instruction	Minimum	40%
Research/Professional Activity	Minimum	35%
Department/University/Public Service	Minimum	10%
	Maximum	20%, within which no more than 10% can be designated to public service.
Administration	Maximum	20%

A faculty member with significant departmental or university administrative responsibilities may allocate up to 20% of merit for administration. This time may be reallocated from any of the other three areas of merit as negotiated and approved by the department head prior to the beginning of the annual evaluation period. The minimum percentages for the other three areas of merit do not apply to those with administrative responsibilities. The merit evaluation associated

with the activities of each director will be reported and evaluated under the area of administration.

Each faculty member is reminded to make an appointment with the department head each year to jointly establish personal goals and objectives for the upcoming evaluation period and to discuss their relative importance within the context of the department's goals. This meeting should be scheduled as soon as possible after the faculty member receives this year's evaluation from the department head and may coincide with the consultation concerning this year's evaluation with the department head. It is expected that the previous year's statement will be considered during the annual evaluation and goal setting process (See FS C-45.1).

- 9 Previous Year Materials: Materials, which were credited in the previous year should not be presented in the current year for recognition. Annual evaluation is designed to give feedback to the faculty and to provide a fair and objective basis for the allocation of annual salary increases, therefore it is based on the faculty's current annual performance.

### **Sample Request for Materials**

Department of Political Science  
M E M O R A N D U M

**TO:** Faculty

**FROM:** Head

**DATE:**

**RE:** Request for Evaluation Materials

Please prepare your materials for our annual merit evaluation process. These should include a current vita, a narrative responding to the attached **EVALUATION GUIDELINES**, and appropriate supporting materials. I will be unable to recommend a merit increase/equity increase for anyone choosing not to submit these requested materials.

Your materials may be submitted to the secretary. The Faculty Evaluation Committee has requested that files be completed by \_\_\_\_\_. The new deadline will permit completion of the processing of student evaluations before materials are due. Please be certain to have student evaluations completed before the end of the semester.

Remember to make an appointment with me to discuss your goals and objectives for next year as soon as possible after you have received this year's final merit evaluation.

## Appendix A

### Guidelines for Ranking Research Contributions

#### Publications

The following ranking of research contributions will be used as a guideline in the evaluation process:

1. Peer reviewed books, peer reviewed edited books, and peer reviewed articles in major political science journals. For major political science journals, please refer to Fenton Martin and Robert Goehlert, *Getting Published in Political Science Journals* (Washington, D.C.: The American Political Science Association, 5<sup>th</sup> edition, 2001). The department has two copies in the main office.
2. Peer reviewed articles in journals in related disciplines, in specialized journals, in monographs and as chapters in edited books.
3. Peer reviewed textbooks, readers, and annotated bibliographies.
4. Peer reviewed research notes
5. Non peer reviewed books and articles, textbooks, readers and annotated bibliographies, and chapters in specialized journals and in books.
6. Non peer reviewed research notes
7. Encyclopedia articles
8. Book reviews.

#### Guidelines for Evaluating Grants and Contracts

The department values the receipt of external grants and contracts. Receipt of extramural grants and contracts are important indicators of research activity and academic reputation, and these awards benefit the department directly through financial resources to support GRAs/GTAs and so forth. The weight given for grants and contracts during merit review is based on the nature of the awarding process, the magnitude of the award, and the benefit to the department.

The greatest weight will be given to external grants or contracts<sup>3</sup> that 1) are awarded through a peer reviewed process, 2) where the magnitude of the award or contract generates research overhead money for the department and/or salary savings that revert to the department, and 3) where part of the award is used to finance at least one GRA/GTA for at least two semesters. During this two semester period (where the summer can be considered one semester), multiple external contracts or grants may be added together to meet these three criteria.

---

<sup>3</sup>Contracts must include the provision that researchers will be able to use any data derived from the research and to publish any work resulting from the research after 6 months to a maximum of 1 year from when the contracted research is complete.

## APPENDIX B

### Expectations of Professional Research Activities

The following guidelines reflect the department's expectations for scholarly activity. To receive a rating "fair" for the area of research during merit evaluation, faculty members should maintain an active research agenda. The primary evidence that a faculty member is maintaining an active research agenda during an annual evaluation period is:

1. Presenting a paper at a professional conference, or working on one or more scholarly studies, or working on a book length manuscript(s), or working on an externally funded research proposal.  
and
2. Attempting to publish one or more scholarly works in appropriate outlets (journals, edited books, university/commercial presses) or submitting grant proposal(s) to an external funding agency.

Because the process of publication can be lengthy, faculty members may claim in their merit files studies initiated/presented in previous years provided they show evidence of meaningful progress toward the revision and/or publication of these works.

In addition to these minimal expectations, faculty members are encouraged to apply for small university research and travel grants, serve as panel discussants and/or panel chairs at professional conferences, review manuscripts for journals and presses, publish book reviews, sit on editorial boards, etc. While all of these professional research activities enhance each faculty member's research agenda and merit evaluation, by themselves, these supplemental activities don't constitute evidence of an active research agenda.

In general, faculty members who receive an evaluation of "very good" for the area of research for an annual evaluation period will have:

1. Published<sup>4</sup> one book during an annual evaluation period.  
or
2. Published at least one article or book chapter (single or multiple authored) during an annual evaluation period.  
or
3. Obtained external funding for a research proposal during an annual evaluation period.

The final evaluation earned by a faculty member in the area of research depends on the volume of research activities, the quality of these research activities, and the extent to which these research activities match the department's priorities for publication or external funding (See Appendix A).

Because publication and funding opportunities do not always follow a calendar year, faculty members' evaluation in the area of research will reflect a three year moving average (current year plus the two previous merit evaluation years).

---

<sup>4</sup> Only scholarly works that have been published within the period of evaluation, as determined by the date of publication or copyright, are considered published.

## **Department of Political Science Professorial Performance Award<sup>5</sup>**

To qualify to be recommended to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences for a professorial performance award, the faculty member must be a full-time, full professor, in rank for at least six years, who has demonstrated sustained level productivity in the area of scholarship for the last six years. In essence, the faculty must produce, within a six-year time frame, a level of scholarship that is equivalent to what the department expects for an associate professor to be promoted to a full professor.

### **Minimum Criteria**

- A candidate must have earned a merit evaluation of excellent or above in the area of scholarship in most of these six years, with at least two years being rated as outstanding; and received a merit evaluation of at least “very good” for instruction and service for most of these six years.
- A candidate must have produced a level of scholarship that is equivalent to what the department expects for an associate professor to be promoted to a full professor during these six years (see “Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor, Publications”).
- By university rule, the six-year time frame must include the most recent performance review.
- A candidate may be awarded a performance award no more than once every six years.

### **Process**

Any candidate, who meets these minimum criteria, may apply for a performance award. To apply, a candidate must assemble a performance award file that documents her/his scholarly accomplishments over the past six years. A candidate’s file should include all the elements of a typical promotion file, but unlike a promotion file, should include only summary information regarding instruction and service.

The candidate will submit her/his file to the Rank and Tenure committee which will review the file and make a written recommendation to the Head. Outside, peer-reviews of each candidate’s file are not required. Using input from the Rank and Tenure committee, the Head will make a decision regarding whether to forward the file to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences with a positive or negative recommendation. The Head’s recommendation will be shared with the candidate. The ultimate decision of whether a candidate is awarded a performance award is made by the Provost.

The timelines for this process will be established each year by the Provost’s office, but candidates should know that this process will begin sometime in January of each year. Prospective candidates are encouraged to consult with the department head and the chair of the Rank and Tenure committee to help determine if he/she meets the minimum criteria.

---

<sup>5</sup> Standards developed and approved by faculty in May 2006 and reapproved on May 7, 2010.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE**  
**MINIMAL EXPECTATIONS FOR FACULTY PERFORMANCE<sup>6</sup>**

In keeping with Sections C31.5-31.8 of the University Handbook, the Department of Political Science adopted the following minimal standards for our faculty. If these are not met, "dismissal for cause" proceedings will follow. These standards were adopted with suggestions at a department meeting on February 5, 1977. Those suggestions have been incorporated and this document represents unanimous agreement of all faculty.

The decision to invoke C31.5 must take into account a faculty member's overall performance including areas of responsibility with the weighted importance (%) of each area, weaknesses not balanced by strengths and/or predetermined agreements between the faculty member and department head about the relative importance of different areas of responsibility. Action may be taken to initiate "dismissal for cause" as provided for in Section C31.5 of the Faculty Handbook. As with any policy, allowances should be made for health and family circumstances that affect a faculty member's work performance. The following standards do not in any way affect departmental expectations for annual merit evaluations, promotion and/or tenure already approved by the Dean of Arts and Sciences and the Provost. However, one additional category will be added to annual evaluations, viz. "fallen below minimal acceptable levels of productivity".

**A. Research**

1. Minimal standards. The department expects all faculty to meet at least one of the following requirements.
  - a. One recent research paper submitted or revised and resubmitted for publication within the past two years, or
  - b. Presentation of one recent research paper at a professional meeting within the past two years, or
  - c. Submission of a major grant proposal for external funding within the past two years.
2. Exceptions.
  - a. The faculty member develops a new course or substantially revises an existing course equivalent to a new course. Examples might include development of new distance courses or revisions involved in shifting a course from one curriculum category to another.
  - b. The faculty member is working on a longer range project and shows evidence of progress (e.g. a book or other research project).
  - c. The faculty member is engaged in some other scholarly pursuit that is expected to enhance the overall reputation of the department, college or university (e.g. editing a professional journal or chairing a professional association).
  - d. New faculty who are working on their degrees or who have received the Ph.D. within the last year may receive a one year extension on these requirements. Note: this does not affect departmental expectations for granting of tenure.
  - e. Submission to scholarly journals or other publication fora that have particularly long notification times.
  - f. Where faculty have past exemplary records and/or may be developing new research interests and can show evidence of progress in the new field.
  - g. Special understandings exist between the faculty member and department head regarding items a - f, or other circumstances such as sabbatical leave.

**B. Teaching**

1. Minimum Standards. The department expects all faculty will meet each of the following

---

<sup>6</sup> Originally approved in February 1997; reapproved by faculty on May 7, 2010.

requirements:

- a. Carry normal teaching loads.
- b. Show evidence of up to date teaching materials (syllabi, handouts, tests, etc.).
- c. Provide evidence of satisfactory teaching competence using a combination of student evaluations, syllabi, other teaching materials. Other sources of teaching evaluations such as peer review may also be used with the faculty member's consent.
- d. Meet classes, hold office hours and advise students.

2. Exceptions

- a. Faculty member is on sabbatical or other leave
- b. Variations in teaching loads on agreement with the department head.

C. Service. Minimum standards will be met if the faculty member serves in a satisfactory manner on a normal number of departmental committees.

### SPECIAL APPEALS REGARDING MINIMUM STANDARDS

Faculty members may appeal to the department head to accept alternatives to the performance criteria outlined. It will be the responsibility of the faculty member to prove that suggested alternatives are adequate substitutions. Should this procedure prove unsatisfactory to the faculty member, she/he may appeal to the full tenured department membership.

### DEPARTMENTAL PROCESS

A. The dept head will follow procedures specified in the University Handbook Sections C31.5-31.8.

B.

1. Should those procedures and attempts to improve performance fail, the department head will bring the case to a meeting of the department's tenured faculty with a recommendation. The department head and the faculty member must each document their side of the case in writing and all materials prepared and submitted to the full tenured faculty must be available to each other as well. Any relevant documentation may be submitted by either party.

2. The full tenured faculty will select a chair among themselves who is not the department head. The tenured faculty will then hear the arguments from the head and faculty member. Members of the faculty may ask questions pertaining to the case of either party.

3. After hearing both sides and questioning them, the tenured faculty may discuss the case and will vote on whether to accept the department head's recommendation to the Dean to invoke dismissal for cause procedures. The number of "yes" votes, "no" votes, and abstentions will be recorded by the chair. The total votes along with any recommendations the faculty wish to make will be forwarded by the chair to the faculty member, department head and Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. As with tenure and promotion decisions, confidentiality of individual votes and comments will be protected.

C. This process in no way prevents a faculty member from pursuing a formal grievance using the process outlined in the University Handbook should the faculty member not agree with the final resolution.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE**  
**Annual Reappointment, Mid-Tenure Review**  
**Tenure and Promotion Procedures<sup>7</sup>**

**Annual Reappointment:**

1. Dates Established by University: Non-Tenured faculty are considered for reappointment during the spring semester of their first year (for year 2), once during the fall and again during the spring of their second year (for years 3 and 4), and during the spring semester in subsequent years until tenure reappointment. The dates for these evaluations are established by university in accordance with Appendix A of the University Handbook.
2. Candidate Invited to Submit Dossier: The candidate for reappointment is invited to compile a complete dossier, including vita, publications and teaching evaluations, and to make it available in the departmental office for review by tenured faculty.
3. Faculty Recommendations: The tenured faculty are invited by letter to submit written recommendations to the department head concerning the reappointment. Faculty are also welcome to comment on the record and performance of the colleague being considered for recommendation.
4. Discussion Session: A meeting of the eligible faculty is scheduled at least 14 days after the release of the candidate materials (see Section 53.1 of University Handbook), and prior to the deadline for the tenured faculty recommendations, during which the performance of the candidate for reappointment is discussed. The meeting is designed to provide an opportunity for a sharing of perspectives. No votes are taken at this meeting.
5. Letter of Recommendation to Dean: The department head, having received recommendations from participating tenured faculty, decides on a reappointment recommendation, which is then communicated to the Dean of Arts and Sciences in a letter. The letter includes a report of the level of faculty support for the recommendation, including arguments for or against the reappointment.
6. Letter to Candidate: The department head subsequently reports the substance of the recommendation to the candidate, along with any relevant comments on performance.
7. Letter to Faculty: The department head also notifies the tenured faculty concerning the reappointment recommendation.
8. Tenure Clock: Provisions for stopping the tenure clock of untenured faculty members are outlined in the KSU Faculty Handbook, sections C82.1 to C82.9. Consistent with the KSU Faculty Handbook, a candidate may seek tenure before the sixth year (C82.4).

---

<sup>7</sup> Revised Evaluation and Tenure and Promotion Procedures accepted by department on April 25, 2003 and reapproved on May 7, 2010. Based on original documents dated 1992 and revised in 1995.

## **Mid-Tenure Review**

1. **New Procedure:** The policy of conducting a mid-tenure review (MTR) for non-tenured faculty was established in April 1992. Faculty will normally go through the MTR process halfway through their tenure period (e.g., in the third year of appointment for an assistant professor without credit for prior teaching experience). This is consistent with C.92.1. of the Faculty Handbook.
2. **Procedures:** The department head will plan to follow the procedures used for tenure review, but will not request external evaluations.

## **Tenure/Promotion**

1. **Dossier:** The candidate for tenure and/or promotion is requested to submit a complete dossier, in accordance with formats and procedures provided by the Provost and Dean (see attached packet of instructions).
2. **External Evaluation:** Upon request from the department head, the candidate will provide a list of up to ten references as possible reviewers of the candidate's work. Three of the candidate's references and three more not listed by the candidate will be chosen by the department head in consultation with the Rank and Tenure Committee and other tenured faculty. The total number of referees will be six. Outside references should be familiar with the candidate's work but not in so close a relationship as to compromise objectivity (e.g., former professor, etc). The candidate reserves the right to request that one name not be included in the potential referee pool, but will not have access to the names of those referees selected by the department. The department head will request the participation of the selected referees, send them copies of the candidate's publications and other records of appropriate accomplishment, and then collect their letters of reference. These letters will then be made available for review by all tenured faculty members.
3. **Faculty Review:** Tenured faculty and/or faculty at rank(s) above that to which promotion is being considered review documents and make written recommendation to the department head.
4. **Discussion Session:** As with reappointment, a non-voting discussion session without the candidate present is held prior to the deadline for faculty recommendations in order to provide full scope for consideration of strengths and weaknesses of the candidate.
5. **Department Recommendation:** After reviewing written faculty recommendations, the department head prepares a recommendation letter to the Dean of Arts and Sciences and submits it with the forms and supporting materials prepared by the candidate. The department head's letter includes an indication of the degree of support from faculty, including relevant arguments for and/or against promotion or tenure.
6. **Notification:** The department head notifies the candidate and the participating faculty of his/her recommendation. Subsequently, the candidate will be notified by the recommendation of the Dean.

### **Note on Appeals:**

A faculty member who disagrees or is not satisfied with the final decision made upon her/his reappointment, tenure, promotion, or merit salary may use the appeal process as provided in the KSU Faculty Handbook, Section C and Appendix G.

## Standards for Mid Tenure Review

### Standard

It is expected that the faculty member being reviewed should be able to demonstrate an ability to teach a variety of courses at both undergraduate and graduate levels and to be an effective advisor. They should also have a research agenda and record publications submitted or accepted that will indicate a potential for meeting the standard for tenure and promotion in at least three years. They should be participating in and contributing to the committees and affairs of this department.

### Criteria

The criteria used for this review are the same as for tenure and promotion adjusted for the time in rank.

### Standard for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Promotion to associate professor rests on substantial professional contributions that reflect excellence in teaching and research. Service to the political science department, the university, and the larger academic/professional community and society is expected.

### Criteria

In making a recommendation for tenure and promotion the department is saying that the candidate has excellent credentials for advancement and also has demonstrated versatility and talent, consistent with the current and anticipated needs of the department.

**Teaching:** Teaching excellence is essential for promotion and tenure in this department. Convincing evidence of effective teaching includes an ability to teach well a variety of courses at both the introductory and advanced levels. The candidate is also expected to advise students and provide them with letters of reference when appropriate.

Persuasive evidence of good teaching includes student evaluations, syllabi, tests, teaching awards, student accomplishments under supervision of the faculty member and letters of appreciation from former students. These examples are not meant to be exhaustive but are some of the suggestions from the University's Effective Faculty Evaluations manual (pp. 8-9).

**Research:** The following are the department's expectations for a candidate's publication record at the time of the tenure decision.

- At least five peer reviewed<sup>8</sup> articles in academic journals are expected. Candidate should provide evidence of journal and peer review process. Leading general political science journals are expected to be among the mix of publications.<sup>9</sup> In order to demonstrate intellectual

---

<sup>8</sup> Here and elsewhere in this document "peer review" refers to the process by which a publisher/editor obtains evaluation of the candidate's research from anonymous academic peer (i.e., political scientists or faculty in public administration, or other experts in appropriate disciplines), not chosen by the candidate, and upon whose judgment rests the publication or rejection of the candidate's research. For reference on this process, consult the process of anonymous peer review practiced by the American Political Science Review and other major political science journals.

<sup>9</sup>For major political science journals, please refer to Fenton Martin and Robert Goehlert, *Getting Published in Political Science Journals* (Washington, D.C.: The American Political Science Association, 5<sup>th</sup> edition, 2001 [or

independence, single-authored publications should also be in the mix of publications.

- A peer reviewed book published by a university or commercial press can count for two to three articles, depending on the quality of the press and the reviews of the book. Peer-reviewed edited books, published by a university or commercial press can count for one or two articles. Candidates should submit evidence of peer review when submitting reviewed publications for consideration. Candidates for tenure who publish their dissertations as scholarly books need to publish the equivalent of an additional three peer reviewed articles/chapters.

To apply towards tenure, books, articles, chapters, etc., must be formally accepted by the publisher and, except for minor typographical and formatting changes be, in their final form. Evidence of such acceptance should be submitted.

A research agenda for the future is required. The submission of grant applications for university and external funding will be expected.

In order to evaluate the quality of the publications submitted by the candidate six outside reviewers will be utilized. The candidate will provide a list of up to ten reviewers, from which three will be selected, while the department will choose three others not listed by the candidate. For more details of the outside review procedure, see point 2 under Tenure and Promotion.

Candidates in the tenure track at the time this document goes into effect have the choice of referencing and adhering to the previous document (1995) when assembling their tenure packet.

**Service:** While a candidate will be expected to participate in and contribute to departmental affairs and committees, where possible he or she should also contribute professionally beyond the department.

### **Standards and Criteria for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor**

#### **Standards for Promotion.**

To be promoted to full professor, an individual should have a national or international reputation in the discipline of political science or within his or her sub-discipline. He or she should also have a distinguished record in teaching and service to the university.

#### **Procedures**

In making a decision regarding the promotion of an individual to the rank of full professor, all full professors in the Department will review the professional record of the individual concerned. They will meet to discuss the candidate's application and then forward their opinions individually to the department head who will forward their opinions and his or her own recommendation to the dean. (See Faculty Handbook C150-C152.5)

---

most recent edition)). The department has two copies in the main office.

## **Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor**

**Publications:** The minimum expectations for a candidate for promotion to the rank of full professor will be: (1) a peer reviewed book and at least three peer reviewed articles, (2) two peer reviewed books, or (3) the publication of at least five peer reviewed articles since promotion to the rank of associate professor. The majority of these publications should be singled or first authored, and with options one and three, major political science journals should be in the mix of publications. A Peer-reviewed edited book, published by a university or commercial press can count for one or two articles. Although promotion will not be recommended on the basis of a textbook alone, a textbook or selected chapters from a textbook can be considered as part of the candidate's application provided original research is involved. The candidate should also present a research plan to cover the next five years. He or she is also expected to be involved in applying for grants.

To apply toward promotion, books including textbooks submitted by the candidate must be peer reviewed. Preference will normally be given to books published by a university press. In all cases, the candidate should submit evidence of the peer review process and any other evidence of the work's quality, such as reviews of the book after publication, citation of the book by peers, etc.

In order to evaluate the quality of the publications submitted by the candidate, six external reviews will be obtained by the department. The candidate will provide a list of up to ten reviewers from which three will be selected. The head in consultation with the faculty will choose three others not from the candidate's list. For more details of the outside review procedure, see point 2 under Tenure and Promotion.

**Teaching:** To evaluate the quality of the candidate's teaching, the Department will review student evaluations and solicit copies of the candidate's syllabi and other relevant course materials developed over the period since tenure. The candidate is encouraged to review pp. 8-9 of the Effective Faculty Evaluations manual for other evidence he or she may wish to submit regarding teaching effectiveness.

Candidates are expected to teach effectively at all levels and to advise both undergraduate and graduate students as part of their teaching responsibilities. The candidate should demonstrate a willingness to meet with students, write letters of recommendation and mentor them in their careers. Candidates should have evidence of supervision of graduate students.

**Service:** A candidate for full professor should demonstrate involvement in areas of university and community service related to his or her expertise.

**Professional Standing:** The candidate is expected to demonstrate his or her involvement in the discipline at an appropriate level. Evidence of such involvement may include participation in panels at professional meetings, participation in governance of professional associations, service on editorial boards of journals, frequency of citation by other scholars in the field, and service as a peer reviewer for journals and book publishers.

Candidates at the associate professor rank at the time this document goes into effect have the choice of referencing and adhering to the previous document (1995) when assembling their promotion packet.