

Faculty Evaluation Plan, Political Science Department

Purpose: To articulate the standards and procedures for the annual evaluation of faculty within the Department of Political Science.

Applies to: Faculty within the Department of Political Science

Introduction

Faculty in the Department of Political Science shall perform teaching/mentoring, mentoring, research, and service at levels of quality appropriate for faculty in research universities. Therefore, teaching and mentoring should impart to students the knowledge gained in our discipline. Research should seek to advance that knowledge. Service should enhance the operation of the department, the College and University, as well as promote the international discipline of political science.

Statement of Performance Expectations

1. Unit Expectations

Fundamental expectations for faculty performance are stated in the Faculty Code of Conduct. The sections below catalog the variable indicators of quality in teaching, research, and service used in evaluations. These are normally weighted 40 percent, 40 percent, and 20 percent respectively.

Teaching/Advising

Evaluation of teaching performance is based on available student evaluations (see [Appendix A](#)), course syllabi, examinations and related information. Excellence in teaching is indicated by favorable quantitative feedback scores, positive student comment sheets, student and peer letters on classroom performance, reports of extensive supervising of student research activities, mentoring and advising students, and other teaching-related activities outside of the classroom, undertaking extensive teaching responsibilities, receipt of University teaching awards, seeking and attaining of grants related to teaching activities, and the peer evaluations of members of the Advisory Committee on the quality of teaching.

Research

Research performance ratings derive from the quality and quantity of research, publications, grants and papers. Excellence in research is indicated by the extent and type of research and publication, reviews from publishers and peers, citations of work, the reputation of the journal or publisher accepting an author's work, seeking and attaining research grants, and peer evaluation by members of the Advisory Committee of the quality of the research.

Service

Faculty members are evaluated in terms of the quality and quantity of their service to the Department, the College, the University, the profession, and the public at large.

Performance evaluation in the Department of Political Science is conducted by the elected Advisory Committee, consisting of four faculty members, and the chair. The Committee uses the indicators above to perform peer evaluation on the following 10-point scale: 1-2 (unacceptable), 3 (unsatisfactory), 4 (satisfactory) 5-6 (good), 7-8 (very good) to 9-10 (excellent).

2. Standards for Acceptable Performance for Faculty Members

A tenured faculty member who receives an evaluation below four in the annual performance evaluation in any of the categories of teaching/advising, research, and service will be urged to work with the chair and advisory committee to develop a targeted faculty development plan. The plan should lead to improvements in performance to at least a satisfactory evaluation. The plan is voluntary, but three consecutive ratings below four (i.e., failure to achieve a satisfactory rating) will lead to implementation of the University evaluation and dismissal plan.

3. Differential Allocation of Effort

The Department of Political Science expects faculty to devote equal attention to teaching and research. When evaluating faculty performance, the department applies the weights of 40 percent for teaching, 40 percent for research, and 20 percent for service to the University, community, and profession. These weights are the same for tenured and non-tenured faculty, although the department recognizes that the specific contributions of faculty members to the department's mission will differ depending on career stage.

Changes in the standards 40/40/20 allocation of effort for a set period of time can be initiated by the tenured faculty member or department chair. These changes can be short- or long-term and must correspond to changes in work-load not just evaluation criteria. Reasons for alterations can include short-term items such as funded research or longer term career-stage issues. Faculty members are not allowed to reduce their teaching or research to less than 10 percent on DAE agreements. Departmental needs take precedent over individual needs when making decisions to alter a faculty member's allocation of effort; such redistribution must be consistent with the best interests of the unit. The most likely occasion for consideration of such changes is in discussion between the chair and the individual faculty member following annual performance evaluations, or sooner so that appropriate arrangements may be made at the unit level for the coverage of course offerings. Any individualized changes in faculty allocation of effort will be negotiated with the Chair and documented in the faculty member's personnel file.

For short-term DAE agreements (one academic year or less), the DAE is ultimately approved by the unit director or chairperson, with a copy of this endorsement sent to the contact associate dean. For long-term DAE agreements (lasting one year or beyond), approval must also be sought from the appropriate contact dean in the college. All DAEs are reported annually to the College Dean's Office. Agreements for long-term DAEs must be reviewed every three years, although either the faculty member or chairperson/director may request an earlier review in response to changed circumstances or performance. At that time, the agreement may be revised, terminated, or continued.

The selection among these options should be made following the guidelines and process for approval of long-term DAEs contained in the University Policy on [Differential Allocation of Effort \(DAE\)](#).

Annual Evaluation System

1. Overview

In response to a call issued by the department chair in December of each year, each faculty member submits a formatted report on the previous calendar year's activity (see attached Appendix B). The completed report along with required portfolio items is due on the deadline date specified in the department chair's call – typically no later than early March.

These reports are combined with student evaluations to form a dossier for each faculty member. On the basis of materials submitted, each member of the Advisory Committee evaluates every faculty member on

the scale above. Teaching and service are considered on the basis of calendar year activities, while research is viewed from a three-year calendar perspective.

Evaluation of faculty members who have been on leave for the period under review: Faculty members whose approved leave takes them away from making normal contributions in teaching/advising, research, or service can have the normal 40-40-20 weighting of teaching, research, and service renegotiated with the chair when they request leave to request the kinds of work that they will be doing while on leave. For faculty members who are on leave without pay for health or family reasons and not performing any University responsibilities, an evaluation is not expected and normally no merit would be given.

2. Portfolio or Annual Report Preparation

NOTE: Faculty are responsible for annually maintaining their PRO record, which is also accessed by administration for reports such as the College snapshot of departmental productivity. PRO provides an annual activity report and faculty are advised to view and update their PRO reports before submission of the faculty member's portfolio to the unit. In classifying your work as major and minor, please bear in mind the definitions in the unit's [Promotion and Tenure Guidelines](#).

Each faculty member submits the following material to the Advisory Committee: 1) the Faculty Annual Report (to see the required categories and multiple sources of data to document teaching/advising, research and service, see Faculty Annual Report); 2) a current curriculum vitae; 3) two most immediate past annual reports (to assess the three-year research component of the ratings); 4) all student evaluations (from the department); 5) syllabi, examinations and other relevant materials from courses; 6) peer evaluations of teaching; 7) all research and writing; 8) letters of acceptance of manuscripts or grant requests; 9) reviews of manuscripts and grant proposals; and 10) all letters, reports, and other materials relating to service.

3. Portfolio or Annual Report Review and Evaluation

At a special meeting of the Advisory Committee held in late March or early April, committee members present and discuss their rating of each faculty member.

These ratings are based on the information in the faculty member's portfolio and on the quantity, quality (level of journal/publisher, value of learning generated in a course), significance and impact (especially the generation of citations, funding, and student teaching awards) of teaching/advising, research, and service. A score is assigned for each faculty member in the areas of teaching, research, and service by taking the mean of the final ratings of the committee members. At the appropriate call for the awarding of merit, the chair uses the committee scores to compute a weighted overall rating for each faculty member by the following formula: Overall merit = $2(\text{teaching/advising rating}) + 2(\text{research rating}) + (\text{service rating}) / 5$.

4. Annual Evaluation of Feedback Process

The chair informs each faculty member of his or her Advisory Committee evaluation ratings through a written statement of evaluation made available no later than May 1. This letter consists of qualitative assessments of the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member in the areas of teaching/advising, research and service. Each faculty member is invited to discuss the evaluation with the chair and/or with members of the Advisory Committee. A copy of the written evaluation is maintained in the faculty member's personnel file.

5. Post-tenure Review and Integration into the Annual Evaluation Process

For faculty undergoing a post-tenure review in given year, the post tenure review process should be followed by the departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee (see <http://policy.ku.edu/CLAS/post-tenure-review-political-science>). The post-tenure review process and assessment will be separate and distinct from the Advisory Committee's annual evaluation of the faculty member.

6. Outcomes of the Annual Performance Evaluation

The evaluation process of the Department of Political Science, seen in all its aspects, yields multiple outcomes. It acknowledges faculty accomplishments or shortcomings and makes them matters of record. It initiates discussions that influence the planning of both individual career development and unit evolution. It assists in the identification of opportunities for faculty improvement and renewal. It provides annual as well as cumulative data for merit-salary recommendations, sabbatical-leave and grant applications, tenure and promotion decisions, post-tenure review, and reassignments of responsibilities. And it provides documentation that may be used, at extremes, in support of either recognition or dismissal.

Faculty Development: Recommendations and opportunities for faculty development and continued learning, as well as information for the progress toward tenure and/or promotion review, and suggested strategies for improvement or renewal, noted by the Advisory Committee are communicated in the chair's letter to each faculty member. The Committee and chair should use the overview gained in evaluation to suggest collaborations and new directions.

Procedures for developing performance improvement plans

If the chair ascertains that a faculty member's performance seems to be failing to meet academic responsibilities, the administrator and the faculty member shall develop a written plan of methods to improve the faculty member's performance. The plan may include appropriate provisions for faculty development, such as campus opportunities for faculty continued renewal and development, or for other appropriate interventions. The chairperson may call upon the University administration for assistance in constructing such a plan, including provision for additional resources, where needed. A faculty member may reject any plan recommended to aid performance levels, but the faculty member must understand that a sustained overall failure to meet academic responsibilities is a basis for dismissal.

Procedures for addressing failure to meet academic responsibilities

Within one week of the receipt of the Advisory Committee's evaluation, any faculty member may request reconsideration from the chair. Faculty who seek review should be prepared to submit additional information that might clarify or enhance the portfolio previously submitted. The chair will present these requests and their justifications to the Advisory Committee. The aggrieved faculty member has the right to meet with the Advisory Committee for purposes of reconsideration. Cases of reconsideration will be decided by the chair, in consultation with the Advisory Committee. The chair informs the petitioning faculty member of the resulting evaluation.

If a faculty member has been informed that his/her performance fails to meet academic responsibilities, the faculty member may request a review by a faculty committee designated to hear such matters in the College. The review committee will issue a non-binding recommendation on the appropriateness of this conclusion to the unit administrator. The administrator may change the evaluation after receiving the committee's decision, or may choose not to do so. In any event, the report of the committee will become a permanent part of the faculty member's personnel file within the academic unit and shall be available to the faculty member.

Department chairs shall consult annually with the dean, and the dean shall consult annually with the Provost on the progress of any faculty member who fails within this category of failure to meet academic responsibilities.

Sustained failure to meet performance expectations

Based upon the judgment that there has been a sustained failure to meet academic responsibilities, the Dean may recommend to the Provost that a tenured faculty member be dismissed. In making this determination, the Dean shall consider the nature of the failure to meet academic responsibilities, the reason or reasons for this failure, the number of years that the faculty member has failed to meet academic responsibilities, the level of discernible improvement in the faculty member's performance after being notified of any failure in performance, and the extent to which the faculty member has complied with the terms of any plan developed to improve the faculty member's performance. The Provost will review the case and, if the Provost agrees with the Dean's recommendation, the Provost will recommend to the Chancellor that the faculty member be dismissed. If the Chancellor agrees and recommends dismissal, this recommendation will go to the Faculty Rights Board.

Should any recommendation to dismiss be brought against a tenured faculty member based exclusively or in part on grounds of sustained failure to meet academic responsibilities, both the report(s) of the review committee(s), the annual written evaluation(s) of the unit administrator concerning the faculty member, any outside evaluations, and any germane written response by the faculty member to the charges shall be made available to the Faculty Rights Board.

7. Faculty Development Initiatives

The Department believes that faculty development opportunities should be available to all faculty members, not limited to faculty with performance difficulties. All new faculty members are assigned a mentor (drawn from tenured faculty) to assist in developing professional norms and strategies.

Teaching: The principal resources for the improvement of teaching lie at the collegial level in our department, and then at the University level. We attempt to maintain an active, yet informal, policy to help new colleagues and colleagues who are making a transition to a new course or attempting new teaching methods.

All faculty members are encouraged to improve their teaching through programs and initiatives offered at the Center for Teaching Excellence.

Research: University-related opportunities for faculty development include the mentoring policy for new faculty, the faculty development fund, General Research Fund grants, sabbaticals, and a number of ad hoc opportunities that arise. Outside the University, there are two important faculty development opportunities. The first is the competitive Big 12 fellowship program to travel to another Big 12 university for several weeks. The second is the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) at the University of Michigan. The ICPSR runs workshops each summer that teach mathematic and statistical courses.

Research Intensive Semesters (RIS): CLAS offers all junior faculty members in good standing a reduced teaching responsibility at some point during the faculty member's pretenure employment. Faculty members will be released from classroom teaching duties for up to one semester, depending upon the relevant departmental teaching expectations, and will be expected to concentrate on research intensive activities. Faculty members are eligible for a research intensive semester assignment up to and including the spring semester before their publication dossiers are sent out to external reviewers in June, with the latest possible Research Intensive Semester (RIS) assignment typically being the second semester of the fifth year. Faculty members in good standing who have stopped their tenure clock remain eligible for a

RIS assignment. The actual decision of which year/semester the individual is assigned a research intensive semester will be made in consultation with the department chair. Note that paid leaves and fellowships do not take the place of a RIS. Once the unit director approves the RIS for the junior faculty member, the details concerning the RIS should be confirmed to the faculty member in writing and documented in their personnel file. The unit director also provides a copy of this authorization to the College Dean's Office so that RIS data can be tracked. Faculty members who are granted a RIS are expected to continue to meet their usual duties regarding departmental advising and other service activities.

See [Faculty Development Programs](#) for information about additional faculty development opportunities.

Appendices

Appendix A – Student Evaluation of Teaching

Appendix B – Faculty Annual Report

Appendix A – Student Evaluation of Teaching

Instrument(s) used in the evaluation of student teaching; the Department of Political Science utilizes the University's "Student Survey of Teaching" form as this instrument.

Appendix B – Faculty Annual Report

Department of Political Science Faculty Annual Report

January 1 - December 31, ____
Name _____

I. Teaching Activities

A. Innovative Efforts/New Course Development

B. Other Teaching Contributions

C. Comments Related to Teaching

D. Enrollment Advising

For each type of enrollment advising listed, please indicate the extent of your activity. If you claim a greater than normal level of activity, please provide some detail in support of the claim.

Level of Activity for the Calendar Year

	Lighter than Normal	Normal Share	Greater than Normal
Freshman-sophomore			
Political Science Majors			
Graduate Students			

1. Supportive Detail for Claims of "Greater than Normal"

E. Advising

Please name those students for whom you have served as a special advisor (i.e., beyond signing enrollment cards and beyond being students in one of your courses). Also indicate the nature of your advising activity with each student (e.g., Ph.D. dissertation advisor, extensive reviewer of dissertation, MA thesis advisor, advisor of non-thesis MA student, director of special readings topic, director of senior honor's thesis, mentor of University Scholar). Also indicate the approximate number of hours you devoted to each specified student last year.

Student	Relationship with Student	Hours

II. Research

A. Publications

List below any publication **actually appearing in print** or any work which was **accepted for publication** during this calendar year review period. Indicate refereed items and any other evidence of quality judgments.

1. Books and Monographs
2. Articles, Chapters in Books
3. Book Reviews
4. Other Completed Publications or Research
5. Papers or Monographs Currently Under Review
6. Papers Given at Conferences and Other Professional Research

B. Presentations

C. Research Grants

Received or Sought (please indicate the status of the proposal and the grant amount)

D. Work Now in Progress

Use additional page if necessary.

E. Intellectual Development

Use additional page if necessary.

III. Service

A. Professional Organization Activity

1. Positions Held in Professional Organizations
2. Panel Participation (other than paper presentations listed in Section II)
3. Service as Professional Journal or Book Manuscript Referee or as Promotion/Tenure Reviewer for Other Institutions. Note: Please indicate the journals for which you did reviews and the number of reviews for each.

B. University Service Activity

1. Department Activity
2. College Activity
3. University Activity

C. Other Service Activity

Provide information here on any other service activity, not covered under the categories of professional or university service.

IV. General Comments

Submit any comments you think are pertinent to evaluation of your performance for the year.

V. Praise for Other KU Political Science Department Faculty

Review, Approval, & Change History:

05/01/2017: Approved by the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

04/27/2016: Approved by the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences

10/28/2016: Approved by the faculty of the Political Science Department

07/01/2016: New Section 5 on Integration of Post-Tenure Review into the Annual Evaluation Process was added by direction of the Provost Office. New Boilerplate text replaces the current text at the beginning of Section 6:

The evaluation process of the Department of Political Science, seen in all its aspects, yields multiple outcomes. It acknowledges faculty accomplishments or shortcomings and makes them matters of record. It initiates discussions that influence the planning of both individual career development and unit evolution. It assists in the identification of opportunities for faculty improvement and renewal. It provides annual as well as cumulative data for merit-salary recommendations, sabbatical-leave and grant applications, tenure and promotion decisions, post-tenure review, and reassignments of responsibilities. And it provides documentation that may be used, at extremes, in support of either recognition or dismissal.

09/25/2015: Added the following statement to Section III.B. Portfolio or Annual Report Preparation:

NOTE: Faculty are responsible for annually maintaining their PRO record, which is also accessed by administration for reports such as the College snapshot of departmental productivity. PRO provides an annual activity report and faculty are advised to view and update their PRO reports before submission of the faculty member's portfolio to the unit. In classifying your work as major and minor, please bear in mind the definitions in the unit's [Promotion and Tenure Guidelines](#).

05/20/2014: Approved by the Provost

04/15/2014: Approved by the Dean of the College

02/19/2014: Approved by the faculty of the Department of Political Science

Approved by:

Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

Approved on:

May 1, 2017

Effective on:

May 1, 2017

Review cycle:

Every three years

Related Policies:

[Board of Regents requirements \(II.C.8\)](#)

[Article 7 Section 4 of the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations](#)

[Faculty Evaluation Policy for tenure-track and tenured faculty](#)

[Faculty Code of Rights](#)

[Unit's Post-tenure Review Policy](#)

[Unit's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines](#)

Contact Information:

Department of Political Science

University of Kansas

504 Blake Hall

1541 Lilac Lane

Lawrence, KS 66045

kupols@ku.edu

785-864-3523