

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION

Department of Politics and Government

Proposed to the Professional Standards Committee, November 2009 (Approved 3/24/11)

I. Preface

This document is intended as a guide to Politics and Government faculty in the evaluation process. It is the responsibility of all participants in the evaluation process to review this document together with a) the provisions of the Faculty Code relating to tenure and promotion, and b) the Professional Standards Committee document entitled "Faculty Evaluation Criteria and Procedures."

II. Participation in the evaluation process

Tenure-line faculty are expected to participate in the evaluation of their colleagues. There are two normal exceptions. First, tenure-line faculty on leave may choose not to participate. Colleagues on leave may review the file and submit a letter to the chair, which should be read aloud by the chair during the department deliberation. Second, tenure-line faculty members in their first year of their appointments to a tenure-line faculty position will review the file, observe classes, and attend the department deliberation meeting, but are free to submit brief letters indicating that they do not feel sufficiently qualified to evaluate their colleagues in any or all of the evaluation categories.

III. Teaching

The Department regards excellent teaching as indispensable for promotion or tenure. All evaluatees must demonstrate dedication to and potential for excellence in undergraduate instruction.

The Department believes that excellent teachers:

- design courses that challenge students with rigorous assignments and interesting and timely course material.
- help students learn to think, write, and speak critically and analytically.
- encourage a diversity of views and perspectives when appropriate
- establish clear expectations and standards both in their written course syllabi and guidelines, and in their classroom instruction.
- organize course sessions clearly and effectively.
- design assignments, examinations, and exercises that help assess student mastery of course material.
- evaluate student work thoroughly, clearly, fairly and reasonably promptly.
- accommodate reasonable student requests for assistance.
assist students out of class by holding ample and regular office hours that are posted and honored.

- demonstrate a willingness to revise old courses, incorporate new approaches, and experiment with different pedagogical tools.
- demonstrate expertise and knowledge in their teaching areas.

In order to assess teaching excellence the Department will depend on all of the following methods:

1. Peer Observation: The Department greatly values peer observation of teaching and views it as an important measure of teaching effectiveness.

a. The Department normally requires each tenure-line faculty member participating in a third-year review, a tenure review, or a review for promotion to full professor to attend at least two classes during the period of evaluation to observe evaluatees. The Department also recognizes less formal means of evaluation such as mutual consultation and discussion of teaching, techniques, and materials.

b. For all department-wide reviews except for third-year reviews, tenure reviews, and promotions to full professor, the Chair, in consultation with the evaluatee, is responsible for insuring that at least three departmental members conduct an adequate number of classroom visitations. Each of these three departmental members will attend a minimum of two class sessions. Normally, at least one of these colleagues will have tenure. All colleagues have the right to attend evaluatees' class sessions and are welcome to do so, and all colleagues shall review evaluations and other teaching materials submitted by evaluatees. The colleagues assigned by the Chair to attend classes will issue a written report to the Department summarizing their observations, and will discuss their observations during departmental deliberations. During department deliberations the observations of these colleagues will be considered, along with those of any other department colleagues who have chosen to visit classes. All colleagues have the right to have their observations of the evaluatee's teaching weighed in the deliberative process.

c. Normally, colleagues conducting peer evaluations will avoid situations in which more than two colleagues are observing the same class session. Where possible, the department chair will try to make sure that class visits are spread out across courses and across semesters during the evaluation period.

2. Student Evaluations: The Department regards student evaluations as an important indicator of some aspects of teaching quality. The Department expects that colleagues will take student evaluations seriously and that evaluatees will attempt to address problems that are raised repeatedly in the evaluations. Evaluatees will include in their files those evaluations required by the Faculty Code. Departmental tenure-line faculty will examine course evaluations for strengths, weaknesses, and trends, assigning greater weight when students' comments concern matters that students know well (such as the perceived difficulty of the course, accessibility to or availability of faculty, perceived enthusiasm of the faculty member, perceived organization of class sessions, perceived degree of challenge) than when students evaluate matters more appropriate to peer evaluation (for

examples, rigor, currency and comprehensiveness of content, appropriate number of assignments). The Department will give less weight to individual comments made by a small number of students, and will instead focus on general trends. The Department is especially concerned that comments by individual students be placed in their proper context. The department believes that even the strongest teachers may occasionally have teaching evaluations that contain a variety of complaints and concerns. Such concerns must always be considered in the context of the overall assessment of teaching provided by peer observation, and by other written materials.

3. Evaluation files: At each review after the first and second-year reviews, evaluatees will include in their file all syllabi and a sample of supplementary materials (such as lecture outlines, handouts, lists of audio-visual aids employed, discussion questions, and descriptions of other class activities) from courses taught during the period of evaluation. These materials ought to demonstrate exemplary commitment to and success at teaching. Department tenure-line faculty will review such materials for evidence of broad and deep content, clearly stated and demanding expectations, and coherent and imaginative pedagogical strategy.

IV. Professional Growth

The Department values professional development as one means to maintain intellectual vitality. The department especially values professional growth that enhances teaching, and/or improves the department, university, and community. The Department expects members to remain current in their sub-fields and especially in their specializations. This currency may come through participating in professional meetings, attending seminars, acquiring further training in methodological or language skills, or otherwise exhibiting their enduring commitment to bettering themselves and their scholarship. In keeping with the liberal arts orientation of the University, the Department will expect a measure of both specialization and eclecticism of all members.

The Department values research and publication. Each member will be assessed for quality, quantity, and impact of research.

1. Quality will be judged by published reviews of the evaluatee's scholarship, colleagues' reading of published and unpublished works, or both.
2. Quantity will be measured by number of conferences participated in, research-related travel undertaken, and publications.
3. Impact of research will be assessed by a range of measures, which may include reviews and citations of works, incorporation of research into courses, presentations before university and broader academic audiences, or assessments by outside evaluators.

V. Advising

The Faculty Code does not specify advising as a criterion for tenure, but the Department nevertheless expects a strong record of advising at every evaluation except first and second-year evaluations. The department regards advising as a major means for teaching students the value of foresight, reason, and responsibility.

The Department expects advisors to offer advisees ample opportunities to meet with them, to monitor advisees' progress and respond promptly to problems, and to refer advisees who seek or need special help to the appropriate campus resource. However, if advisees are to learn values that advisors are supposed to teach, advisees must be encouraged to take as much responsibility for designing their own education as they can. Thus, advisors must help students learn to do what the students cannot yet do; the Department does not expect advisors to do for advisees what advisees can do for themselves.

VI. Service

The Department values contributions to the many communities its members serve. Competent participation in university and departmental governance is expected. The Department encourages regular attendance and attentiveness at meetings, responsible accomplishment of tasks, and willingness to take initiative and otherwise lead. Extra-curricular and co-curricular efforts that enhance the intellectual climate will also be rewarded. Participation in community groups or affairs is also encouraged. Evaluatees will be responsible for mustering evidence of such service.

VII. University and Departmental Need

When the evaluation involves the granting of tenure, the Department will also evaluate whether the evaluatee meets University and Departmental needs.

VIII. Procedures

1. First and second-year evaluations.

The first and second year reviews will offer serious assessments of the performance of evaluatees, including clear suggestions for improvement. The purpose of the first and second year evaluations is to provide evaluatees with information about areas in which their performance should improve looking forward to the third-year and tenure evaluations. The Department Chair will prepare a letter of evaluation that assesses the evaluatee's progress in the areas of teaching and professional development. In preparing this letter the Chair will review teaching evaluations, observe classes, review syllabi and other materials deemed relevant, and assess evidence of professional growth. Evaluatees are encouraged to invite other colleagues to visit their classes and to review their materials if they wish. Those colleagues may forward their assessments and suggestions

for improvement to the chair.

2. Third-year evaluations.

The main purpose of the department's third year evaluation is to provide evaluatees with information about areas in which their performance should improve before the tenure review. Decisions about reappointment are left to the Academic Vice President under the *Faculty Code*.

3. Procedures for third year evaluations, tenure evaluations, promotion reviews, and non-streamlined full professor reviews.

The Department Chair, at the earliest convenient time, will notify evaluatees and all other tenure-line faculty of impending evaluations and will set deadlines for each of the steps listed below.

Evaluatees must marshal relevant materials for evaluation and make them available to department members. Evaluatees must also provide colleagues with schedules that facilitate peer visits to classrooms and ensure that visits will not be intrusive or inconvenient.

Evaluatees must also submit to the chair a statement applying each of the criteria above (III, IV, and VI in tenure and third year review cases, III through VII in all other cases) to the evaluatee's record.

Tenure-line department members then submit to the Chair by letter individual assessments of each evaluatee according to criteria above.

The Chair will convene a meeting comprising only tenure-line faculty, excluding the evaluatee. Only those who have submitted letters to the chair before the start of the meeting can participate in the deliberations. Those faculty members will deliberate and, where required by the Code, make a mutual or majority recommendation.

In the case of a closed evaluation file, the Chair will compose two letters on behalf of the Department, one letter summarizing individual letters, and another expressing the Department's decisions and summarizing any deliberative meetings of the Department. The letters will be given to the evaluatee and will become part of the evaluatee's file. In the case of an open evaluation file, the Chair will summarize only the deliberations of the Department. In both open and closed evaluations, all colleagues who attended the deliberation meeting will be asked to sign the summary of deliberations, acknowledging their agreement that the letter is an accurate summary.

The Chair will assemble all materials and letters and submit them to the Academic Vice President's office.

Evaluees will verify receipt of all materials by the Academic Vice President's office.

Evaluees who are dissatisfied with the department's recommendation are advised to consult the Faculty Code for appeal procedures. In the event of an informal appeal the department urges the Chair to operate with the maximum possible transparency and is encouraged to share any written response to the appellant with department colleagues.

ADDENDUM TO THE POLITICS AND GOVERNMENT EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR THE MELLON PROFESSOR OF GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLITICS

I. Preface

This document is an addendum to the evaluation processes and criteria established by the Department of Politics and Government for the Professor of Global Environmental Politics. It is the responsibility of all participants in the evaluation process to review this document together with a) the Politics and Government Department evaluation criteria, b) the provisions of the Faculty Code relating to tenure and promotion, and c) the Professional Standards Committee document entitled "Faculty Evaluation Criteria and Procedures."

II. Participation in the Evaluation Process: third year evaluation and tenure

The Professor of Global Environmental Politics will be evaluated by the Politics and Government department along with two members of the Environmental Policy and Decision Making Program. The director of the Environmental Policy and Decision Making program, in consultation with the evaluatee and the academic Dean, shall establish the Environmental Policy and Decision Making program's participants in the evaluation process. These participants will be part of the deliberation process. Any changes to the environmental studies participants must be agreed upon in writing by the evaluatee, the academic Dean, and EPDM director.

III. Participation in the Evaluation Process: first and second year reviews

The chair of P&G will conduct first and second year reviews. These reviews will be based on classroom visitations, a reading of student evaluations of teaching, and evidence of professional growth and grant-related activity provided by the evaluatee. The P&G chair should consult with the head of Environmental Policy and Decision Making program during the evaluation, but the P&G chair alone is responsible for this evaluation.

IV. Criteria Unique to the Position of Professor of Global Environmental Politics

This addendum modifies and clarifies evaluation criteria for a unique tenure-line position that was made possible by grant monies from the Mellon Foundation. The University was granted this award to establish a tenure-track position in global environmental politics, and the grant carries with it responsibilities in three areas: curricular development (including faculty workshops), conference and co-curricular programming aimed at fostering connections between the campus and the wider world in discussions of environmental policy and decision making, and international travel associated with student/faculty research and learning opportunities.

The position in Global Environmental Politics will be evaluated according to the criteria set forth in this addendum through the tenure decision. That is, the addendum shall remain in place for the time period covered by the Mellon foundation grant and the remaining years when the candidate will be funded from normal University resources. The criteria for tenure, as amended by this section, shall not change when the grant ends.

The Politics and Government criteria for evaluation shall apply to the tenure-track position, amended as follows:

The department will apply its normal standards in the evaluation of teaching. The department expects that due to the demands of the Mellon grant for curricular and co-curricular programming, conferences, and international travel, the balance among professional growth, university service, and community service will differ from typical cases.

In addition to evaluating the evaluatee's performance in all of the standard areas of evaluation, evaluators will assess her success in meeting the responsibilities of the Mellon grant. The evaluatee should include evidence in the file detailing work to (a) expand the curriculum to explore international dimensions of

environmental policy and decision making through faculty workshops, seminars or other curriculum development tools, (b) foster co-curricular connections between the campus community and the wider global community on international environmental issues, and (c) develop opportunities for students and faculty to engage in research and/or other teaching and learning experiences abroad focused on environmental policy and decision making. The committee will carefully consider the evaluatee's self-analysis of her efforts to meet the obligations of the position and grant.

In addition, the evaluation committee welcomes letters from outside the university that speak to the unique community service component this position.

ADDENDUM TO THE POLITICS & GOVERNMENT EVALUATION CRITERIA
FOR THE POSITION OF
PROFESSOR OF ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY AND DECISION MAKING
(Approved by the Professional Standards Committee 4/8/13)

I. Preface

This document is an addendum to the evaluation processes and criteria established by the Department of Politics and Government (PG) for the Professor of Environmental Policy and Decision Making. It is the responsibility of all participants in the evaluation process to review this document together with a) the politics and government departmental evaluation criteria, b) the provisions of the Faculty Code relating to tenure and promotion, and c) the Professional Standards Committee document entitled "Faculty Evaluation Criteria and Procedures."

II. Participation in the Evaluation Process

For all department wide reviews excluding third year reviews, tenure reviews, and promotion to full professor, the PG Department Chair, in consultation with the evaluatee, is responsible for insuring that at least two politics and government departmental members and one environmental policy and decision making (ENVR) faculty member conduct an adequate number of classroom visitations. The individuals serving as the PG members may also be contributing members of the ENVR Program. The individual serving as the ENVR member may not also be a member of the PG Program. Each faculty member designated to conduct classroom visitations will attend a minimum of two class sessions. Normally, at least one of these colleagues will have tenure. All colleagues have the right to attend evaluatees' class sessions and are welcome to do so, and all colleagues shall review evaluations and other teaching materials submitted by evaluatees. The colleagues assigned by the Chair to attend classes will issue a written report to the Department summarizing their observations, and will discuss their observations during departmental deliberations. During department deliberations the observations of these colleagues will be considered, along with those of any other PG or ENVR colleagues who have chosen to visit classes. All PG and ENVR colleagues have the right to have their observations of the evaluatee's teaching weighed in the deliberative process.

For third year reviews, tenure reviews, and promotion to full professor, the Professor of Environmental Policy and Decision Making will be evaluated by the PG Department along with two members outside of the PG Department who serve the ENVR Program. The Director of ENVR, in consultation with the evaluatee and the Academic Dean, shall establish the ENVR participants in the evaluation process. These participants will be part of the deliberation process. Any changes to the ENVR participants must be agreed upon in writing by the evaluatee, the Academic Dean, and the ENVR Program Director.

For reviews that are eligible for alternative review process, also known as "streamlined" evaluations (Chapter III, Section 5 of the faculty code), the Professor of Environmental Policy and Decision Making may elect to have the review by a head officer of the PG Department, a head officer of the ENVR Program and the Academic Dean.

In these cases the faculty member consults with the head officers from PG and ENVR about the review at least two months prior to the start of the semester in which the evaluation is scheduled. The chair of PG will determine whether a full review or a “streamlined” review is warranted and reports that decision to the Dean. The evaluatee prepares a file and submits it to the departments. The head officers write a joint letter of evaluation, which they both sign and forward along with the file to the Dean. The evaluatee’s file is made available for colleagues in both PG and ENVR and they “have the option of” reading it, but colleagues are not required or even expected to do so (Faculty Code, Chapter III, Section 5.c). External letters, colleague letters from inside or outside the department, and class visits are optional. Given that any additional letters (external or internal) will not be representative of the whole department or the processes of the full review, those letters can be sent on to the Dean and included in the head officer’s letter only at the discretion of the head officer.