

Department of Political Science
Promotion and Tenure Evaluation
Guidelines

Approved: 2013

Department of Political Science

GUIDELINES FOR RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE
(version adopted in Mar. 2013)

The Faculty Handbook (§III.E.2.b., III.E.6., & III.E.7.) outlines the criteria for promotion and tenure as well as the process required to achieve these. Tenure and promotion requirements are not identical to merely summing up or averaging yearly evaluations. For example, consistently satisfactory scores in research in an individual's yearly evaluations might be achieved largely on the basis of having research in progress; however, obtaining a satisfactory rating in research for tenure or promotion would require published works. By the same token, a person might have five years under evaluation in which the exceptional scores in yearly evaluations were a minority, yet the entire body of work might be sufficient to earn an exceptional rating for tenure and promotion. In accord with department policy, promotion to the rank of full professor will require the candidate to receive an exceptional rating in two performance areas; one of these exceptional ratings must be in the area of teaching. Promotion to the rank of associate professor requires an exceptional rating in any of the three performance areas under review.

The Faculty Handbook directs the department head and the departmental Personnel Advisory Committee (PAC) to evaluate performance (exceptional, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory) in teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service. In the Department of Political Science, the following guidelines are used in tenure and promotion decisions by both the department head and the PAC. The Tenure PAC is comprised of all tenured faculty – with the exception of faculty members who have a role in tenure and promotion decisions outside of the department (e.g. in Academic Affairs, in the Dean's Office, or via a joint appointment with another department).

Standards for Performance Areas

Teaching:

The PAC will determine whether an individual's teaching merits an exceptional, satisfactory or unsatisfactory rating based on various factors including: instructional effectiveness, the quality of academic advising and mentoring, contributions to curricular and program development, and other achievements related to teaching. Candidates for tenure and promotion who seek an exceptional rating should ensure that any evidence submitted regarding Paragraph I below includes materials from course preparations taught during the period under review. In the year immediately preceding the application for promotion and/or tenure, all courses should be evaluated.

- A Meeting classes as scheduled
- B Meeting at least 5 office hours per week
- C Course syllabi which clearly state the goals and objectives of the course, standards for grading, and course requirements
- D Course assignments appropriate to the level and subject matter of the course
- E Grading which demonstrates the instructor's ability and willingness to differentiate

levels of student performance

- F Questionnaires, letters, and other responses from recent graduates and others which supports the contention that students have learned well
- G Student evaluations providing information concerning:
 - 1. clarity of major objectives in courses and effectiveness in meeting these objectives;
 - 2. commitment to assigned classes, as evidenced by class preparation, thoroughness of presentation, reasonably prompt grading, and return of papers;
 - 3. attitude toward students, as evidenced by receptiveness to questions, good student-faculty rapport, and availability outside of class.
- H Additional course activity such as
 - 1. involvement in experimental courses and/or interdisciplinary offerings;
 - 2. innovations in teaching methodology or in course development/revision;
 - 3. participation in honors and other special studies projects when the opportunity to do so exists.
- I Course materials beyond the syllabus; such as exams, instructions for assignments or graded assignments, use of other teaching resources.
- J Supervision of special studies and theses which produces good results
- K Contributions to development of new or improved courses or programs
- L Writing letters of reference
- M Effective student mentoring (aiding with students' professional development and job placement, research, professional organizations, etc.)
- N Effective academic advising.
- O Participation in special examinations: MA, MPA, MS; preparation of placement examinations and examination for credit.
- P Giving special lectures, seminars in research literature, and other topics
- Q Attendance at workshops, conferences, etc., devoted primarily to the enhancement of teaching
- R Receiving a teaching fellowship
- S Any additional relevant evidence – the candidate should explain the relevance of this evidence.

Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications

The PAC will determine whether an individual's scholarly achievement merits an exceptional, satisfactory or unsatisfactory rating based on the individual's professional qualifications and the quality of scholarly achievement. The PAC considers the totality and individuality of the applicant's scholarly achievement, in terms of evidence of primary and secondary importance, to determine whether this achievement is exceptional, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory.

While the PAC retains discretion to tailor its judgment to the individual situation of each applicant, it generally expects candidates to achieve the following: For a satisfactory rating, candidates are expected to publish three peer-reviewed journal articles or equivalent (see Evidence of Primary Importance) during the evaluation period (that is, on average one article every other year for tenure and promotion). For an excellent rating, candidates are expected to publish five peer-reviewed journal articles or equivalent (see Evidence of Primary Importance) during the evaluation period (that is, on average one article per year for tenure and promotion). For either satisfactory or excellent ratings, evidence of primary importance has to include at least one item listed under Evidence of Primary Importance B.

The PAC has the discretion to evaluate a publication (evidence of primary importance in category B) as the equivalent of one or more than one research article. This judgment is based on the scope of the research involved (for example, a book project may contain several original research studies), the reputation and selectivity of the publication (for example, a book published in a top university press), the degree to which a long-term project has reached completion (for example in the case of book projects), and the benefit to the university. The PAC expects the candidate to make a strong case for a publication or equivalent to count for one or more than one article.

To evaluate the weight of items C-E of the Evidence of Primary Importance, the PAC will use its discretion, based on the same criteria used for publications (scope of the work, reputation and selectivity, degree of completion, benefit to the university). Because of the inherent difficulties in assessing the weight of items C-E listed under Evidence of Primary Importance, applicants should be aware that achieving three items in B remains the most straightforward path to a satisfactory rating in this category.

The PAC bases its decision exclusively on the documentation and supporting material provided by the applicant. Therefore, it is the applicant's responsibility to provide the PAC with the information needed to evaluate the scope, reputation, selectivity, degree of completion, and benefit to the university of publications and other research output, as applicable.

Evidence of primary importance

- A Possession of an appropriate terminal degree. (In political science, this is the Ph.D.; in public administration, it is the Ph.D. or the D.P.A.)
- B Publication of scholarly works in media of international, national, regional, or state distribution, (including books of original research, textbooks, monographs, articles in refereed journals and chapters in books – in which the editorial process involves meaningful review rather than self-publication, reprint, or translated reprints).
- C Editor of a recognized journal or other recognized publication.
- D Receiving a major external grant.
- E The receipt of prestigious awards or other honors for scholarly work from

international, national, or regional organizations

Evidence of secondary importance

- A. Consulting which enhances professional qualifications
- B. Papers or presentations given before international, national, and regional scholarly professional bodies
- C. Continuing professional development or professional revitalization through formal course work, workshops, and short courses.
- D. Organizing and presiding at panels for international, national, and regional professional meetings
- E. Engaging in recognized research, including unpublished or ongoing research
- F. Refereeing of research manuscripts and other scholarly material.
- G. Non-refereed scholarly activities such as publication of book reviews, reprints and translations of prior publications, participation as discussant at international, national, and regional professional panels.
- H. Membership, participation, and attendance at meetings of professional organizations.
- I. The receipt of awards or other honors for scholarly work from international, national, or regional organizations.
- J. Participation in departmental or campus-wide seminars or colloquia.
- K. Receiving an internal grant or a small research grant or fellowship from nationally recognized institutions
- L. Writing a published study guide or producing a published test question database or other educational materials
- M. Any additional relevant evidence – the candidate should explain the relevance of this evidence.

Note: Papers are to be counted in the year they are actually presented. Articles are counted in the year accepted for publication. Should the material be published electronically, the same standards will apply that are used to judge printed material, e.g., the selectivity of the source, prestige of the source, nature of the audience, quality of the product.

Professional Service

The PAC will determine whether an individual's service merits an exceptional, satisfactory or unsatisfactory rating based on various factors, including the complexity of the tasks performed, the number of roles filled, the substance of the work completed, the time commitment involved in the service, etc.

- A. Regularly attending department faculty meetings
- B. Regularly participating in routine department discussions regarding curriculum and instruction, hiring, departmental policy changes, etc.
- C. Service as chair of university, college, or departmental committees, commissions, or governing bodies
- D. Service as a member of university, college, or departmental committees, commissions, governing bodies
- E. Service as officer of national, regional, or state professional organizations
- F. Conducting workshops, symposia, training sessions relevant to one's professional area
- G. Other related professional service to the community including consulting, media appearances, presentations to public and private organizations, etc
- H. Membership on the governing boards of public agencies which are directly related to one's professional area
- I. Special assignments or recognized special contributions to the university, college, or department of exceptional importance and requiring exceptional contributions of time and effort
- J. Sponsoring or serving as advisor to student organizations
- K. Any additional relevant evidence – the candidate should explain the relevance of this evidence.
- L. Service as coordinator for a graduate, major, or minor program.

TEMPORARY ADDENDUM to GUIDELINES adopted on 3/15/13: For all professors serving as JMU employees at the time of this revision, the PAC is instructed to consider either the 2007 guidelines or these revised guidelines for applications for promotion involving review periods underway at the time of this revision. During this transition period, the PAC shall use whichever guidelines it believes put the candidate in the more favorable light. In turn, all professors joining the faculty subsequent to March 2013 are subject to this 2013 version of the guidelines.

March 2013