

PERSONNEL POLICY

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

DATE APPROVED BY DEPARTMENT: October 23, 2020

Approved by the A&S Personnel Committee: January 27, 2021

Approved by the A&S Dean's Office: Feb. 8, 2021



ARTICLE I: THE PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

- A. The Personnel Committee shall consist of four members elected by the faculty of the Department.
 - 1. The Committee shall elect its own Chair.
 - 2. No member of the committee may participate in the deliberation of his or her own evaluation.
 - 3. Eligibility for service and length of service on the Committee shall be governed by the Department by-laws.

ARTICLE II: ANNUAL WORK PLANS (AWPs)

- A. To achieve the Departmental mission, each faculty member is normally expected to:
 - 1. make a substantial commitment to teaching
 - 2. engage in research
 - 3. perform department, college, university, community, or professional service
- B. The exact workload allocation is subject to negotiation among the chair, the individual faculty member, and the Dean's office. Allocations must meet all criteria specified by Departmental, College, and University policy.

ARTICLE III: Pretenure, Tenure, and Promotion in Rank

I. Introduction

A. General Policies

The Department of Political Science follows the procedures and timeline for pretenure review, tenure, and promotion that are laid out in A&S Personnel Policy and Dean's guidelines, as well as in the Redbook. When a faculty member has a primary appointment in one department but contributes significantly to the teaching, research, or service of a second department, the procedures for promotion and tenure are governed by the A&S Personnel Policy.

Faculty accomplishments that occurred prior to employment at University of Louisville may be considered as part of the tenure and promotion record. As stated by the Redbook (Section 4.2.2), “[p]revious full-time service with the rank of instructor or higher or comparable status in institutions of higher learning may be counted toward the acquisition of tenure.”

B. Definitions of Teaching, Research, and Service

Candidates for promotion and tenure will be evaluated on the basis of teaching, research, and service unless otherwise specified by contract (if applicable) and Annual Work Plan (AWP). Below, we define each of these activities and describe types of evidence that may be used to demonstrate performance for each activity. When examples are given, they are intended to be illustrative but not exhaustive.

1. Definition of Teaching

- a) The Department recognizes that a variety of teaching styles and approaches may lead to high-quality instruction.
- b) Examples of instructional activities include teaching undergraduate and graduate courses, internship supervision and instruction, authoring or revising textbooks, mentoring, applying for or receiving educational grants, development of new courses and teaching methods (such as distance or on-line learning and instructional technology improvements), and service-learning initiatives.

2. Definition of Research

a) Forms of Research: Political science research takes a wide variety of forms that vary based on subfield, methodological approach, and audience. Solo authored work and co-authored work are both valued forms of publication and vary in their usage across subfields and across disciplines. It is the responsibility of individual faculty members to communicate subfield norms (with evidence) to contextualize their research output for the personnel committee, if those norms are relevant for consideration of the record.

In addition to publication, research activities directed at an academic audience include but are not limited to the following: data collection and fieldwork; the creation of publicly available datasets; delivering research talks to the department, college, or other scholarly audiences; and presenting conference papers or posters.

In general, the department tends to reward (1) scholarship aimed at a scholarly audience over applied scholarship aimed at a public or practitioner audience, (2) productivity, and (3) peer-reviewed work in reputable presses and journals. “Reputable” outlets are defined as (but are not limited to) those sponsored by a regional, national, or international scholarly association; those published by a university press; those published by a recognized commercial publishing house; or those that are listed on a national/international journal indexing list. Evidence of reputation might also include examples of other work published there, peer reviews, journal impact factor as measured by national/international indexing services, or the names and affiliations of editors and editorial board members.

Political science faculty may also engage in public-facing research activities, which produce non-peer-reviewed products intended to reach a broader audience including the public and/or policy makers (e.g., technical reports). Though not an exhaustive list, some examples include white papers created for policy organizations, community-based research projects, expert witness testimony in legal proceedings, policy memos, and the creation of websites to communicate research to broader audiences. It is expected that faculty will engage in “traditional” research activities at all stages of their career, but that after tenure, faculty may also choose to expand their scholarship to include public-facing research.

b) Textbooks: Defined as books written primarily for a student audience, textbooks are generally counted as instruction rather than research. In general, assistant and associate professors are not encouraged to treat textbooks as part of their research agenda, because of (1) the potential negative effect it may have on external reviews during tenure and promotion, and (2) the time-consuming nature of these projects.

3. Definition of Service

Service consists of the use of professional knowledge and expertise to meet the needs of the Department, College, University, profession and/or community. Service can be categorized as follows:

a) Service to the Department: Examples include, but are not limited to service in a leadership role within the department (Chair or Director), actively serving on department committees, attending department meetings, mentoring new faculty, writing letters of recommendation for students, etc.

b) Service to the College or University: This involves actively serving on committees and/or performing leadership and administrative duties within the College or University.

c) Service to the Profession: Examples include, but are not limited to, serving as a reviewer for academic journals, presses, textbook publishers, or grant proposals; serving as an extramural reviewer for promotion and tenure cases; serving in an editorial role for an academic journal or edited volume; writing book reviews; serving as a conference program chair, organizer, discussant, etc.

d) Service to the Community: Examples include, but are not limited to, media interviews, government service, service on community advisory boards, community lectures, and developing partnerships between the University and the community. Service to the community must be in the faculty member’s capacity as a social scientist.

II. Pretenure Review

As specified in the A&S Personnel Policy, there is a mandatory Pretenure Review at the midpoint of a faculty member's probationary period. The procedures for collecting material for Pretenure Review are the same as those used in tenure and promotion. The primary purpose of the Pretenure Review is to assess whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward tenure and to provide guidance where needed. A&S policy allows for the faculty member or the department's Personnel Committee to request external review, but external review is not a required part of the process.

III. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

A. General

1. Proficiency: The Redbook (Section 4) states that candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor "are required to exhibit broad proficiency in all areas [teaching, research, and service], so as to show continuing promise to develop their individual strengths." The A&S Personnel Policy (Section 2.2) defines "proficient" to mean "having satisfied capably all the special demands or requirements of a particular situation, craft, or profession."

2. Annual Work Plans: The A&S Personnel Policy (Section 2.2) states that "All evaluations of personnel shall take into consideration a faculty member's Annual Work Plans during the period of review." According to the Dean's Guidelines, tenure-track assistant professors will generally have at least 30% of their AWP dedicated to research, but exceptions may be made when the faculty member, Department Chair, and Dean agree. In addition, the review will take into account whether the faculty member has contractual requirements (such as an endowed chair, administrative obligations, and/or other special designations) related to research output or AWP allocation.

3. Early Tenure: A faculty member may opt to go up for early tenure one time, as specified by the guidelines detailed in the Redbook (Section 4.2.2) and A&S policy.

4. Term Faculty: Term faculty are eligible to go up for promotion as specified by A&S Personnel Policy. Procedures for the promotion of term faculty are the same as for tenure-track faculty. Criteria include proficiency in teaching, research and creative activity, and service, but only the areas included in the contract or in the AWP will be assessed. A&S Personnel Policy requires extramural review for promotion for term faculty whose AWP's include research and creative activity. The Redbook (Section 4.1.1) states that "a nontenurable faculty member shall be eligible to apply for and be appointed to a tenurable position."

B. Teaching

1. **Expectations:** Effective teaching transforms and extends student knowledge, makes learning interesting and relevant, generates respect for the discipline and the larger profession, and motivates the student to engage in lifelong learning. The Department recognizes that effective teaching can take many forms.

2. **Types of Evidence:** Proficiency will be assessed by reviewing evidence of teaching activities, peer evaluations, and student evaluations of teaching (SETs). Candidates for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor should assemble a list of all courses taught (including independent studies and supervision of undergraduate or graduate thesis or dissertation committees), SETs, and any additional evidence of proficiency in other areas of instructional activity. For example, this could include engaging in structured mentoring or advising activities, developing new instructional or curricular materials, providing evidence of student learning, or participating in professional development activities about instruction. See the Appendix for more details on possible types of evidence that could be included in a teaching portfolio (optional).

3. **Proficient Instruction:** Based on the evidence assembled, the faculty member satisfactorily meets their AWP teaching commitments, displays competence in instruction in their courses, seeks ways to engage and challenge students, and interacts with students in ways that are respectful and appropriate.

C. Research

1. **Consideration of Annual Work Plans:** The A&S Dean's guidelines for the AWP specify that tenure-track assistant professors generally have at least 30% research on their AWP. According to the Dean's Guidelines, there must be an explicit agreement between the faculty member, the Department Chair, and the Dean to go below these thresholds. For tenure-track or term faculty members who have research percentages below the 30% threshold, progress toward publication is likely to be slower and output diminished, as compared to faculty with typical research allocations. The Personnel Committee should take into account these constraints when evaluating research activities as defined above in the Definition of Research.

2. **Criteria for Evaluation of Research:** In evaluating whether a faculty member's research is proficient, the Department will assess both the quality and quantity of original research. In this body of work, there should be evidence of progress on a research project beyond the dissertation. Except for special circumstances, the expectation is that faculty will have at least some of their publications while at University of Louisville. Examples of progress could include publications, accepted papers, conference papers, (funded or unfunded) grant proposals, book proposals, and journal manuscripts under review.

a) The quality of research will be assessed by publications or acceptances in reputable outlets, as described above in the Definition of Research.

b) The Department recognizes that the quantity of research varies depending on whether a faculty member pursues a strategy of publication more focused on journal articles or on scholarly books. Faculty should pursue a strategy that is appropriate for their area(s) of study. It is the responsibility of individual faculty members to communicate subfield norms (with evidence) to contextualize their research output for the personnel committee, if those norms are relevant for consideration of the record. While each candidate's record is unique and should be considered on its own merits, the Department has historically awarded tenure to candidates with records that show publication/acceptance of about 6-8 peer reviewed journal articles OR a book monograph and additional peer-reviewed articles or book chapters. Other strong cases with a different mix of publication types that demonstrate significant original scholarly contributions can and do get tenure. Solo and co-authored work are both valued forms of publication and vary in their usage across subfields and across disciplines. Faculty members bear the responsibility of contextualizing relevant norms about their research for the personnel committee.

D. Service

1. **Expectations:** The Department recognizes that service can take multiple forms including service to the department, service to the College of Arts & Sciences, service to the University of Louisville, service to the profession, and service to the community at large. Every faculty member has an obligation to participate in service at the department level and is encouraged to do so outside the department, within reason. All full-time faculty members will work with the chair of the department to apportion an appropriate service commitment on their AWP. Generally assistant professors are discouraged from extensive service commitments, but the AWP is negotiable in this regard.
2. **Criteria for Evaluation of Service:** Assistant Professors demonstrate proficiency in service by contributing measurable time to activities deemed as service activities (see the Definition of Service in the Introduction) and/or by measurable accomplishments. The department will use the percentage of time contributed to service on the candidate's AWP as a guideline to determine whether the candidate contributed sufficient time to service activities to warrant a proficient rating. See lists above (in the Introduction) for the types of activities and accomplishments recognized by the department.
 - a) **Measurable Time:** It is up to individual faculty to communicate in their tenure and promotion memorandum the amount of time spent contributed to service activities.
 - b) **Measurable Accomplishments:** Demonstrated service accomplishments at the assistant professor level are not limited to but include the following: departmental committee service, reviewing for journals, serving as a discussant/chair at academic conferences, and community engagement service that produces measurable outcomes and is clearly related to political science.

- 3. Proficient Service:** Based on the evidence assembled about time and accomplishments from above, the faculty member has demonstrated a satisfactory investment of time, yielding reasonable accomplishments.

IV. Promotion to Full Professor

A. General

1. Criteria for Promotion: The Redbook specifies that “promotion reviews shall consider annual reviews and other evidence compiled since the last review for promotion.” The A&S Personnel Policy (Section 2.3) states that candidates for promotion must show evidence of “having attained proficiency in teaching, research and creative activity, and service, and of superior achievement and recognition in at least one area, and shall give promise of continuing performance at or above such levels.” The term “superior achievement and recognition” is defined by A&S policy as "having attained distinction, as recognized by one's peers, in a particular situation, craft, or profession."

2. Consideration of Annual Work Plan. The Personnel Committee must take into account the candidate’s allocation of effort in their AWP for the review period. The Redbook (Section 4) states that “[c]andidates for promotion to professor must be evaluated in the areas and by the distribution of effort specified in their approved Annual Work Plans for the period under review.” A&S Dean’s guidelines for the AWP specify that tenured faculty generally have at least 20% research on their AWP, unless there is an agreement between the faculty member, the Chair, and the Dean to designate a lower amount. In addition, the review will take into account whether the faculty member has contractual obligations related to research output or AWP allocations.

3. Term Faculty: Pursuant to A&S Personnel Policy (Section 1.2), term faculty are eligible for promotion to full professor pursuant to A&S policy. Procedures for the promotion of term faculty are the same as for tenured faculty. The criteria shall include proficiency in teaching, research, and service, but only the areas included in the contract or in the AWP will be assessed.

B. Evaluation of Teaching

1. Rating of Proficient in Teaching: Proficiency will be assessed by reviewing evidence of teaching activities, peer evaluations, and student evaluations of teaching (SETs). Candidates for tenure and/or promotion to full professor should assemble a list of all courses taught (including independent studies and supervision of undergraduate or graduate thesis/dissertation committees), SETs, and any additional evidence of proficiency in other areas of instructional activity. For example, this could include engaging in structured mentoring or advising activities, developing new instructional or curricular materials, providing evidence of student learning, or participating in professional development activities about instruction. See the Appendix for more details on possible types of evidence that could be included in a teaching portfolio (optional).

The rating of Proficient is assigned when, based on the evidence assembled, the faculty member satisfactorily meets their AWP teaching commitments, displays competence in instruction in their courses, seeks ways to engage and challenge students, and interacts with students in ways that are respectful and appropriate.

2. Rating of Superior in Teaching: In order to receive a rating of Superior, the faculty member must go beyond the criteria for Proficient to demonstrate that they have attained “distinction,” as recognized by their peers. “Recognition by peers” encompasses evaluations by the Personnel Committee, colleagues in the Department, as well as peers in the College, University, or discipline. Faculty who wish to be considered for “Superior” in teaching must submit a *Teaching Portfolio* as evidence (see Appendix).

Examples of accomplishments that could demonstrate superior instruction include, but are not limited to, recognition through awards, receipt of educational grants, development of innovative instructional materials or approaches, writing/revising textbooks or courseware, authoring publications about the practice of teaching, taking a supervisory role in instructional activities (e.g., internships, graduate research, undergraduate research), or documented mentoring activities. Descriptions of the quantity and quality of these instructional activities should clearly demonstrate the status of “Superior.”

C. Evaluation of Research

1. Rating of Proficient in Research: This rating indicates that the research record is satisfactory, and the quantity and quality of research post-tenure is similar to quantity and quality of a Proficient research record for tenure/promotion to associate professor. The record may be similar to what was accomplished for tenure. However, the faculty member shows “promise of continuing performance at satisfactory levels or above.” The Personnel Committee should take into account whether the faculty member’s AWP research allocation fell below the Dean’s Guidelines thresholds described above.

2. Rating of Superior in Research: This rating signifies growth as a scholar; it also indicates the development of a positive reputation in the faculty member’s area of expertise, as indicated by evidence and/or external reviews. The faculty member must show “promise of continuing performance at satisfactory levels or above.” Examples of evidence that could support such a rating include, but are not limited to, any of the following. However, the Department cautions against relying exclusively on metrics such as citation counts and book awards.

- a) There has been a consistent high rate of publication in reputable outlets, or;
- b) Over the course of the research record, publications appear in prestigious outlets in faculty member’s area of expertise or in the discipline (if supported by evidence provided by the candidate or external reviews), or;
- c) There is recognition of the candidate’s expertise by scholarly peers (e.g., citations to published work; delivery of invited lectures; attendance in invitation-only

workshops or conferences; nomination for research awards even if not successful), or;

- d) There is recognition by the College or University for research excellence, or;
- e) There is evidence of unusual research achievements for the Department or discipline (e.g., publishing in a top-tier/leading outlet; receipt of a major external grant; being named to a distinguished research endowed chair), or;
- f) There is evidence that publications have had an extraordinary impact on scholars (e.g., high number of citations to published work; disciplinary awards for lifetime achievement; being the subject of a symposium, etc.), or;
- g) There is recognition of excellence of individual works of research by the discipline (e.g., awards for best book, best conference paper, best journal article), or;
- h) There is evidence of a major measurable impact on public policy (i.e., research is the basis for a policy achievement).

D. Evaluation of Service

- 1. Rating of Proficient in Service:** This rating indicates that the service record is satisfactory, and the measurable service time and measurable service accomplishments post-tenure are similar that of a Proficient service record for tenure/promotion to associate professor.
- 2. Rating of Superior in Service:** Associate Professors demonstrate superior performance in service for promotion to full professor by contributing measurable time to activities deemed as service activities AND by measurable accomplishments that significantly exceed what was accomplished for tenure. Examples of this type of service include but are not limited to the following: leadership roles (including those at the department, college, and university levels), leadership roles in the discipline (including state, regional, and national association leadership), editorial roles for academic publications, and receipt of service awards (both within the university and external awards).

It is expected that this effort will be distributed across service to the department, college and/or university, profession, and community. The candidate must attain distinction as recognized by the Department and other peers in both the amount of time they contribute to service activities and in the accomplishments associated with those efforts.

In order to receive a superior rating in service, faculty members must assemble a *Service Portfolio* to include in their promotion materials. This portfolio should include evidence documenting the types of service efforts within each of the broader categories of service to the department, college and/or university, profession, and community. These types can include Governance Service, Professional Service, or Community Engagement, as described here:

- a) Governance Service:** Active participation on department, college or university

committees or demonstrated leadership or administration in department, college or university activities are the best indicators of this type of service.

- b) Professional Service:** Participation in professional organizations, their committees, learned professional societies and service activities show the faculty member's involvement in professional service activities. Leadership roles in professional organizations and societies, consulting and competency programs help to prove effectiveness in this area.
- c) Community-Engaged Service:** The faculty member shows their effectiveness in this area through the application of professional and scholarly skills in (the development of) outreach programs or written reports. This may be through developing collaborations with outside agencies, serving as director of outside boards or committees that partner with the university, or coordinating efforts of university, community and civic partners. They may engage other faculty and students in the dissemination of knowledge and skills to the public and profession in public policy and governmental forums.

ARTICLE IV: PERIODIC CAREER REVIEW

- A. The Department's criteria reflect those in the College of Arts and Sciences' Personnel Policy and Procedures and the University Redbook.
- B. The evidentiary bases for periodic career review are the five prior annual reviews, as specified by College Policy. Expectation for proficient performance for periodic career review is hence the same as it is for the annual reviews: "Satisfactory performance of AWP commitments."
- C. Normally, this satisfactory performance requires that faculty:
 - 1. Make a substantial commitment to teaching. Faculty members should normally teach the variety of courses that best fulfils the instructional mission of the Department and the College. Faculty members also should be willing to work with both undergraduate and graduate students on independent projects, when appropriate. Faculty members regularly should demonstrate proficiency in teaching as measured by student evaluations, peer review, or other appropriate criteria.
 - 2. Engage in research. This activity normally should lead to publication in scholarly, often peer-reviewed, outlets (especially scholarly books or edited volumes and scholarly journal articles). Other outlets may be appropriate as well, and will be evaluated on a case by case basis by the Personnel Committee and the Chair.
 - 3. Perform departmental, college, university, community, or professional service. The exact mix of obligations across these various categories of service will vary according to the needs and mission of the department, the college, and the university, as well as the interests and strengths of individual faculty members.

- D. The level of activity required in each of these three categories for proficient performance shall be commensurate with the individual faculty member's particular workload allocation.

ARTICLE V: ANNUAL REVIEWS

A. Overview

The personnel reviews of the department shall consider evidence in the areas of teaching, research, and service, the definitions of which appear in Article III. Performance evaluations will be based on merit, including contributions to the missions of the department, the college, and the university. In the annual review memo, it is incumbent on the faculty member to document their work and to explain fully the activities and accomplishments for each category (research, teaching and service) under review.

Faculty members will be rated as Not Proficient (NP), Proficient (P), Highly Proficient (HP), or Exceptional (E) in each area and then assigned an overall rating. Each year's rating will then be evaluated along with the ratings from the two preceding years to assign the three-year overall score used for awarding merit raises. (See section F3.)

B. Procedures

1. Evaluation of performance must be made in accordance with the AWP.
2. Each full-time faculty member shall be reviewed annually. The annual reviews shall become part of the record for all subsequent personnel reviews and the basis for salary increases.
3. Each annual review shall take into consideration achievements for the year under review and the preceding two years, as specified by College Policy.
4. Each faculty member must submit to the Personnel Committee a curriculum vitae, Annual Work Plans for the review period, and information relevant to quality of instruction for the review period, including copies of the quantitative results of student evaluations for all courses taught at the University of Louisville during the review period. Faculty members should be prepared to submit additional evidence to the committee if requested.
5. Faculty members are encouraged to submit a cover memo summarizing their achievements for the review period in teaching, research, and service.
6. The Department Personnel Committee, the Chair, or the Dean may request to see evidence of performance at any stage in the review process.
7. Evaluation of the Chair shall include performance of administrative duties. These duties will be evaluated under the category of service. The personnel committee will solicit feedback on the chair's performance of administrative duties from the department faculty and staff and others outside the department including the Dean.
8. A file containing past annual review recommendations will be made available to the Personnel Committee and the Chair.

9. The Department's criteria for annual reviews follow those in the College of Arts and Sciences' Personnel Policy and Procedures and the University Redbook for all matters not specified in this document.

C. Criteria for evaluating teaching

Effective teaching transforms and extends student knowledge, makes learning interesting and relevant, generates respect for the discipline, and the larger profession, and motivates the student to lifelong learning. The Department recognizes that a variety of teaching styles and approaches may lead to high-quality instruction.

As part of their annual review, faculty should provide a summary that lists courses taught, enrollment, any new preparations or substantial revisions of courses, and the number of undergraduate and graduate advisees. Faculty may also provide other evidence if they wish (e.g., teaching philosophy statement, examples of instructional materials, student learning assessments, mentoring activities, professional development related to instruction, honors and recognitions, etc.). Student evaluations of teaching (SET) summary data and comments will be provided to the Personnel Committee. However, because of the well-documented biases associated with SETs, the Personnel Committee and Department Chair should rely on a range of evidence whenever possible to support their assessments of faculty teaching and not focus solely on the SETs.

1. Not Proficient

- a) Definition: demonstrating unacceptable performance in instruction
- b) Examples may include, but are not limited to, situations in which there is a pattern of non-performance or unresponsiveness to students; a significant failure to meet instructional expectations laid out in the AWP; or evidence of unprofessional or inappropriate conduct with students that violates University or College policy.
- c) If the Chair is made aware of allegations of serious and/or persistent problems with a faculty member's instruction, the faculty member in question must be given the opportunity to respond in writing. The Chair must then forward all evidence of the problem and the faculty member's written response to the Personnel Committee. The Committee will then weigh all the evidence and determine whether a NP rating is justified.
- d) If there are allegations of sexual harassment involving a faculty member, these must be reported according to the procedures laid out in the University Sexual Harassment Policy and will not go through the Personnel Committee.

2. Proficient

a) Definition: demonstrating satisfactory performance of all AWP teaching commitments.

b) Examples may include teaching existing courses; serving as a committee member (not chair) for undergraduate or graduate theses/dissertations; and being reasonably accessible to students who need assistance.

3. Highly Proficient

a) Definition: demonstrating a substantial commitment to instruction.

b) In order to receive a HP rating, a faculty member must satisfy the criteria for Proficient, and provide evidence beyond the summary and student evaluations of teaching.

c) Examples may include, but are not limited to, evidence of substantial student mentoring; development of curriculum or instructional tools; new preparations or substantial overhauls of an existing course; publication of a revised edition of a textbook, courseware, or similar; demonstrating student learning progress through pre- and post- assessments or similar; completing professional development workshops or courses focused on instruction; chairing undergraduate honors thesis committees; and chairing graduate theses or dissertations. Accumulation of multiple Faculty Favorite nominations over time may be considered by the Personnel Committee.

4. Exceptional

a) Definition: demonstrating unusual or distinctive performance in instruction.

b) In order to receive an E rating, a faculty member must satisfy the criteria for Proficient, and provide evidence beyond the summary and SETs that illustrates the exceptional nature of instructional achievements.

c) Examples may include, but are not limited to, receipt of a College, University, or discipline-based instructional award; publication of the first edition of a textbook, courseware, or similar; obtaining external funding for instructional needs; leading instructional workshops or courses; or delivering invited lectures on instruction. (Faculty Favorites nominations are not considered to be teaching awards for this purpose.)

d) While there is no set limit on the number of faculty in a given year who may receive the Exceptional rating, the expectation is that this will generally be awarded to a small number of faculty each year.

D. Criteria for Evaluating Research

Because of the publication delays that often occur in backlogged journals, faculty members should receive publication credit for the year that the work was **accepted**, not when the work appeared in print. Faculty members should provide documentation of date of acceptance to the committee and take care not to double count over multiple years.

For books and book chapters, faculty members may receive publication credit for the year that the book appeared in page proofs. For external funding, faculty members should receive credit in the year that the funding began. Faculty members should provide documentation to the committee and take care not to double count over multiple years.

1. Not Proficient

- a) Definition: demonstrating a lack of activity or progress
- b) No or minimal evidence of research activity or progress will result in a NP rating. The Personnel Committee should take into account whether the faculty member's AWP research allocation fell below the Dean's Guidelines thresholds when evaluating the quantity and types of research products considered.
- c) When the NP rating is given, additional mentoring support should be offered to the faculty member to help them achieve Proficient status in subsequent reviews.

2. Proficient

- a) Definition: demonstrating research activity and progress. (For faculty whose contract or position requires a specific level of research output, Proficient is defined as meeting the minimum standard as defined by the contract.)
- b) The acceptance of a single peer-reviewed journal manuscript or a single book chapter in an edited volume should be deemed as Proficient. In the absence of an accepted publication, other examples of output considered Proficient may include any of the following: completed chapters beyond the book proposal stage; a contract awarded for a book manuscript; one or more manuscripts invited to revise and resubmit or that are conditionally accepted; one or more presentations at conferences; one or more manuscript submissions to journals; or one or more submission of grant and book proposals.

c) It is expected that, over the three-year review period under review, at least some work products will progress from the conference, draft, or submission stages to publication.

3. Highly Proficient

a) Definition: demonstrating substantial research output

b) The HP designation indicates that there has been a significant pay-off to a faculty member's research activity and progress.

c) Examples may include acceptance of two journal manuscripts; two book chapters; one accepted journal manuscript and one accepted book chapter; receipt of internal research funds awarded by the University in a competitive process; a revised edition of an existing book; or any two of these in combination.

d) Publication of a single article or book chapter in a top-tier/leading journal or press may also be considered Highly Proficient. The burden is on the faculty member to demonstrate why the Highly Proficient rating should be awarded for publication in that outlet.

e) A consistent track record of publication over each year of the three-year period under review may also be considered to be Highly Proficient.

4. Exceptional

a) Definition: demonstrating unusual or distinctive achievements in research

b) Exceptional research accomplishments may reflect quantity of output, quality of output, or recognition by peers for research achievements. While there is no set limit on the number of faculty in a given year who may receive the Exceptional rating, the expectation is that this will generally be awarded to a small number of faculty each year.

c) Examples may include, but are not limited to, receipt of a College, University, or disciplinary award for research; completion (page proofs stage) of a scholarly book; receipt of a new external funding award; or the acceptance of more than two journal manuscripts or book chapters (or some combination thereof).

d) Publication of a single article in a top-tier/leading journal may also be considered Exceptional, if it is truly an unusual achievement. The burden is on the faculty member to demonstrate why the Exceptional rating should be awarded for publication in that outlet. Possible evidence might include journal ranking,

acceptance rate, impact factor, reputational surveys, or other indicators that publication in an outlet is a rare and noteworthy accomplishment.

e) A scholarly monograph may be rated as Exceptional in two consecutive years, if supporting evidence is provided. This would generally be the year in which the manuscript appeared in page proofs and the year in which the manuscript appeared in print.

E. Criteria for Evaluating Service

1. Not Proficient

a) Definition: demonstrating unacceptable performance in service activities

b) Examples could include, but are not limited to, a persistent failure to attend committee meetings or contribute to an assigned committee's work; a persistent failure to perform the basic duties of a service assignment; severe and/or persistent problems with unprofessional behavior at conferences (see the APSA anti-harassment policy for examples); or a pattern of unexplained absences from conference-related service commitments.

c) If the Chair is made aware of serious and/or persistent problems with a faculty member's service, the faculty member in question must be given due process and the opportunity to respond in writing. The Chair must then forward all evidence of the problem and the faculty member's written response to the Personnel Committee. The Committee will then weigh all the evidence and determine whether a NP rating is justified. As a general note, it should be rare that the NP rating is assigned for service, given the difficulty of quantifying service contributions.

2. Proficient

a) Definition: demonstrating acceptable performance in ordinary service activities within the department and in the discipline.

b) Examples may include, but are not limited to, ordinary service as a member (not chair) of departmental committees; ordinary service as a reviewer for academic journals and presses; service as panel chairs or discussants for academic conferences; and occasional community outreach activities or interviews.

3. Highly Proficient

a) Definition: demonstrating a substantial commitment to service beyond those activities denoted under the proficient category.

b) Examples may include, but are not limited to, service on College, University, or disciplinary committees and/or frequent community outreach activities; a documented high volume of service as a reviewer for academic journals and presses; or a documented high volume of letters of recommendation. It may also encompass leadership roles within the department or outside the department in service activities that require a substantial investment of time, as supported by evidence.

4. Exceptional

a) Definition: demonstrating unusual or distinctive performance in service in the department, college, university, community, or discipline.

b) Examples may include taking a leadership role on a major departmental, college, or university initiative that requires an extensive investment of time; serving as section head for a conference; editing a journal or special issue of a journal; and engaging in significant policy-related work that is not research or teaching. Receipt of a College or University or discipline-based award for service should also result in a rating of Exceptional, assuming that there are no issues with other service commitments. Faculty must provide evidence of the exceptional nature of their service.

c) While there is no set limit on the number of faculty in a given year who may receive the Exceptional rating, the expectation is that this will generally be awarded to a small number of faculty each year.

F. Rating Formula and Distribution of Funds

Each faculty member's rating for teaching, research or creative activity, and service shall be weighted by the Annual Work Plan (AWP) percentage for that category. To calculate the overall rating for a given year, multiply the AWP percentage for each category by the category's rating using the following point values, and then add up over all three categories (teaching, research, service).

1. Points Assigned for Category Rated (Teaching, Research, and Service)

Exceptional	E	2.00
Highly Proficient	HP	1.50
Proficient	P	1.00
Not Proficient	NP	0.50

2. Translation of Category Scores to Overall Merit Rating for Year under Review

A&S policy requires that the annual reviews take into consideration achievement for the year under review and the two years preceding it. In the Personnel Committee letter, both the overall rating for the year under review and the three-year rating should be reported.

The overall rating for the year under review will be calculated by taking the sum of the ratings for each category (teaching, research, and service), weighted by AWP percentage. The sum will be translated into an overall rating as follows:

Exceptional	E	1.60 – 2.00
Highly Proficient	HP	1.25 – 1.59
Proficient	P	0.75 – 1.24
Not Proficient	NP	0.50 – 0.74

The formula will be modified in the following ways to adjust for biases in the AWP percentages related to teaching. In the event that a faculty member earns an Exceptional rating in two categories and the rating for the third category is at least Proficient, the faculty member shall be assigned an overall rating of Exceptional for that year.

3. Assigning the Three-Year Merit Rating

To determine the three-year merit rating, the Personnel Committee shall use the following criteria.

If the same overall annual rating was awarded for each of the three years under review, that rating will be assigned (e.g., HP, HP, HP will result in an HP assigned for the three-year rating).

If two of the three years receive the same rating, the Committee shall assign that score as the three-year rating. (For instance, P, HP, HP will result in a HP for the three-year rating.) When each year within the three-year range receives a different rating, the middle rating will be used (e.g., P, HP, E will result in a HP).

If one year's overall rating was NP, then the three-year rating will be no higher than P.

If no raises have been awarded in the preceding two years, the Chair may designate the three-year rating to be equal to the highest annual overall rating during the current year and two years preceding (e.g., HP, HP, E could result in an E).

4. Distribution of Funds

In years where funds are available, the three-year merit rating will be used to determine distribution of funds. The value of the points awarded shall be the same regardless of rank or current salary. Thus, the monetary value of the award will be based upon a lump sum distribution, rather than a straight percentage calculation of base salary. Pursuant to A&S Personnel Policy, “no reward shall be given for an overall performance of ‘not proficient.’”

ARTICLE VI: Amendments to Personnel Policy

The Personnel Policy may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the department faculty. Proposed amendments must be circulated to all faculty at least one week prior to a department meeting.

APPENDIX: Possible Elements for Inclusion in a Teaching Portfolio
[Adapted from M.A. Waterman, University of Pittsburgh, 1990]

1. Roles, responsibilities and goals:

- a) A statement of teaching roles and responsibilities,
- b) A reflective statement of teaching goals and approaches,
- c) A list of courses taught, with enrollments and comments as to if new, team-taught, etc, and/or
- d) Documentation on the number of advisees, undergraduate and graduate committees
- e) Documentation of mentoring undergraduate, graduate, research or postdoctoral students.

2. Contributions to Institution or Profession:

- a) Service on teaching committees
- b) Development of student apprentice/programs
- c) Assistance to colleagues or profession on teaching (ancillaries)
- d) Review of (instructional) texts
- e) Publications (of practical activity/application) in teaching journals (Scholarship of Teaching and Learning)
- f) Development of curricular or curricular models
- g) Work on curriculum revision
- h) Development and/or evaluation of new educational assessment methodologies.
- i) Obtaining funds/equipment for teaching lab, programs
- j) Provision of training in teaching for graduate students
- k) Development of service-learning initiatives
- l) Development of programs or materials for public education, outreach and awareness.

3. Activities to Improve Instruction:

- a) Participation in seminars or professional meeting on teaching
- b) Design of new courses
- c) Design of interdisciplinary or collaborative courses or teaching projects
- d) Use of new methods of teaching assessing learning, grading, etc.
- e) Preparation of a textbook, courseware, etc.
- f) Description of instructional improvement projects developed or carried out

4. Honors or Recognitions:

- a) Teaching awards from department, college, university or profession
- b) Invitations based on teaching reputation to consult, give workshops, write articles, etc.
- c) Request for advice on teaching by committees or other organized groups

5. Representative Course Materials:

- a) Syllabi
- b) Course descriptions with details of content, objective, methods, and procedures for evaluating student learning
- c) Reading lists
- d) Assignments
- e) Exams and quizzes, graded and ungraded
- f) Handouts, problem sets, lecture outlines
- g) Descriptions and examples of visual materials used
- h) Descriptions of uses of computer or other technology in teaching

6. Materials Showing Extent of Student Learning:

- a) Evidence of stimulation of critical thinking skills among students.
- b) Scores on standardized or other tests, Pre- and Post-tests
- c) Students' lab books, or other workbooks
- d) Students' papers, essays or creative works
- e) Graded work from the best and poorest students with teaching feedback
- f) Instructor's written feedback on student work

7. Evaluations of Teaching:

- a) Summarized SETs, including response rate and students' written comments and overall ratings
- b) Results of students' exit interviews
- c) Letters from students, preferably unsolicited
- d) Comments from faculty (peer) evaluations of instruction on the currency, appropriateness and effectiveness of educational materials, assessments, methods and innovation
- e) Letter from the College Dean or Department Chair

8. Miscellaneous Sources of Teaching Effectiveness

- a) Comments from sources other than students
- b) Statements from colleagues in the department, college or elsewhere on student performance on national, regional, or specialty learning activities.