# AUBURN UNIVERSITY

## COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS

# GUIDELINES

# Political Science Department

Workload
Faculty Annual Review
Third-Year Review
Promotion and Tenure

9/30/11

**FACULTY DEVELOPMENT, ANNUAL REVIEW, AND PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES**
Approved 8/24/09, Updated 4/1/11, Approved by Provost 5/11, Updated to reflect FHB changes 9/30/11

The Department of Political Science Faculty Development and Evaluation Manual supplements and complements the Auburn University Faculty Handbook and College of Liberal Arts guidelines. Since the basic and fundamental review of faculty takes place within the department, the purpose of these guidelines is to describe and elaborate upon the criteria and guidelines for faculty assignments, faculty evaluation, and promotion and tenure at the departmental level. Department guidelines are intended to conform to those of the Auburn University Faculty Handbook (revised 6/17/11) and the College of Liberal Arts. Therefore, it is important for faculty to study carefully the criteria, requirements, and procedures outlined in these guidelines and in the University and College documents. In event of conflict among documents, their precedence is University, College, and Department. Any reference to the Faculty Handbook in this document refers to the most current version.

The Political Science Department's faculty evaluation process is intended to guide faculty toward enhanced success; clarify faculty goals; inform annual assignments that reflect the short and long-term vision of the department; include faculty in discussions and decisions; and provide consistent and clear criteria for promotion and tenure recommendations, as applicable.

The faculty evaluation process in the College of Liberal Arts includes several components, among them the letter of appointment, annual workload assignment, and annual performance reviews and feedback. Tenure track and Clinical track positions include provision for promotion review. Tenure track faculty are subject to a third-year review to determine the extent to which the individual is making clear progress toward tenure. Failure to demonstrate clear progress in teaching, research, outreach, and service (as applicable to the faculty member's assignment) may lead to the issuance of a letter of non-continuance at any time before tenure. The focus of the third-year review for clinical track faculty is the faculty member's progress toward achieving promotion to associate clinical professor, yet still recognizing that clinical faculty are on continuing appointments that necessitate annual contract renewal. Failure to demonstrate clear progress in assigned areas of performance (such as clinical teaching, clinical outreach, service, scholarship, professional development) may lead to the issuance of a letter of non-continuance, effective at the conclusion of the annual contract in force.

Reference to "Tenure track" faculty in this document includes tenured faculty, unless otherwise noted.

The Appointment Letter

The appointment letter defines broad expectations of the position, including percentages of the assignment allocated to teaching, research, outreach, and service. Examples of appointment letters may be found at the following URL:
https://sites.auburn.edu/academic/COLA/CLA_Dean/cladeptguidelines/SitePages/Home.aspx

Annual Workload Assignment

Annual faculty assignments reflect that faculty members working in various disciplines contribute in different ways. Annual assignment plans reflect collaborative discussion between faculty and department chair. They provide opportunity to review progress, set goals, guide faculty toward success, and clarify metrics of evaluation. All Tenure track faculty, Clinical track faculty, Non-Tenure track faculty, Instructors, and Lecturers should participate in formalized annual assignment planning and feedback.

The College of Liberal Arts Workload Guidelines state:

Initial workload assignments for tenure-track faculty (TTF) are negotiated upon hire, and are distributed across all areas of responsibility; teaching, research/creative scholarly works, outreach, extension and service. Occasionally, administrative duties may also be included as a percent of a faculty member's workload if it is part of their normal assignment. Workload assignments may be adjusted on an annual basis during the annual review process to reflect any changes in a faculty member's assignment for the following year. The department head/chair meets with each faculty member during the faculty annual

review process to discuss and negotiate anticipated workload changes. The faculty member signs the annual review which includes the stated workload assignment for the following year to assure that every faculty member is aware of his/her responsibilities. The original signed annual review is to be kept in the departmental personnel file. Three copies are to be submitted to the Office of the Dean (one copy will be kept on file in the Dean's Office, one copy will be placed in the CLA's faculty personnel file and one copy will be delivered to the Office of the Provost).

<u>Description of Types of Faculty Positions</u>

Tenure Track Faculty (TTF)
The "typical" annual teaching assignment for "research active" TTF is 5 courses[1] (or department FTE equivalent) equaling 62.5% per year. Consistent with university guidelines, all research active TTF are assigned a minimum 25% research/creative/scholarly outreach[2] workload for promotion and tenure purposes. The annual teaching assignment for "highly productive" research TTF is 4 courses[3] (or department FTE equivalent) equaling 50% per year. The status of highly productive research TTF requires the approval of the Dean. In situations where a tenured associate professor or professor is not fulfilling a 25% requirement for scholarly activity, the department chair will provide a memorandum of understanding (MOU) to ensure that a tenured faculty member has a 100% workload. In this case, the faculty member would be assigned a differential workload with a minimum of 10% research, in order to stay current in the field for teaching purposes. It is expected that the faculty member will receive an increase in the teaching load, with the understanding that he/she cannot be promoted just on teaching. Research productivity will be considered over a 3 year period. If a faculty member is not research productive for 3 years, then there will be an increase in the teaching load proportionally. During that 3-year period, if he/she does becomes productive and demonstrates that he/she can be productive for 3 years in research, then there will be a reduction in the teaching load to acknowledge the increase in research.

Clinical Track Faculty (CTF)
CTF are generally assigned teaching loads ranging from 5-8 courses a year (or department FTE equivalent). There is not a minimum research workload requirement. According to AU guidelines[4] the clinician title series is a professional series for appointment of appropriately qualified individuals who contribute to the university's academic mission by participation in activities which (1) predominantly involve clinical practice, (2) are of contractually specified duration, and (3) operate under contracts, grants, generated income, or other designated funds. Note, however, that CTF are expected to teach in the clinical setting.

Instructors/Lecturers
Instructors and Lecturers will be assigned 100% teaching loads of 8 courses per year. Any exceptions will need approval by the Dean. In addition to the definition of teaching stated in the faculty handbook, teaching in CLA includes: holding regular office hours, mentoring and advising students, keeping current in the field, attendance of departmental meetings relevant to teaching, participating in departmental life and the engagement of students.

Non-Tenure-Track Faculty (NTTF – as designated by HR)
NTTF may be assigned some teaching; but it cannot exceed one course per semester and three courses per year.

Appendix 1 outlines the university's expectations for teaching, research, outreach, and service.

---

[1] A course is defined as a 3 contact hour course.

[2] "In terms of your questions, it is my understanding that the former Provost said that a tenure track faculty member on hire must have a minimum of 25% research, scholarship of pedagogy or outreach, or creative activity. Therefore, I will continue that tradition." - Email from Dr. Mazey sent to Paula Bobrowski 5/10/2009.

[3] Ibid.

[4] http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/clinician_positions.html#appointment

Workload adjustment for sabbaticals and leaves. Faculty on sabbatical or professional development leave related to teaching would normally be evaluated as a temporary 100% teaching appointment for leave extending across the evaluation period. Faculty on sabbatical or professional development leave related to research would normally be evaluated as a temporary 100% research appointment for leave extending across the evaluation period. A similar allocation may apply for other types of leave. In any case, the evaluation metrics must add up to 100% and factor in the faculty member's regular appointment during the portion of the review period not on leave.

See Appendix 2 for Departmental Workload Guidelines.

Annual Performance Reviews and Feedback

The annual review serves as a tool for faculty development at all ranks, regardless of tenure status.

All faculty receive annual evaluations.  All Tenure track faculty, Clinical track faculty, Non-Tenure track faculty, Instructors, and Lecturers should participate in formalized annual assignment planning and feedback.

*Performance Descriptors.*  The annual review of performance in each area to which one is assigned will be assessed a performance score of 4 - Exemplary (characterizing performance of high merit), 3 - Exceeds Expectations (characterizing performance of merit), 2 - Meets Expectations (characterizing performance sufficient to justify continuation but, for areas of expected significant contribution, not sufficient to justify promotion or tenure), 1 – Marginal (characterizing performance that may not be sufficient to justify continuation) or 0 – Unacceptable (characterizing performance not sufficient to justify continuation).

See Appendix 3 for Workload Distribution and Performance Review Chart.

The annual review normally covers performance for the preceding calendar year. Research productivity will be considered over a 3-year period. Evaluative statements from previous years will be consulted to determine response to previous suggestions for improvement and to determine the extent to which the individual is making progress toward promotion and tenure, if applicable, to their appointment.

See Appendix 4 for Departmental Annual Review Guidelines.

*Written evaluation report*

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

The unit head shall prepare a written report summarizing the major points of the conference. A copy of the report shall be provided to the faculty member within a month of the conference. If there are no objections, the faculty member shall be asked to sign it as confirmation of having seen it. If the faculty member does not agree with the material in the report, he or she may write a response to be appended to the report. A copy of the signed report and response, if there is one, is to be retained for the faculty member's departmental personnel file; another copy is to be given to the faculty member; a third copy is sent to the Office of the Provost. To the extent permitted by law, the report is to remain confidential, available only for the use of the concerned faculty member and any University officials who have supervisory power over the faculty member.

Third-Year Review

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

Each department shall conduct a third year review of all its probationary faculty members. This shall take place no later than 32 months after initial appointment, normally before April 30 of the faculty member's third year. The head shall request a current vita and any supporting material the head or the faculty member deems appropriate prior to the review. The particular focus of this review is the faculty member's

progress toward achieving tenure. The review therefore must address the criteria for tenure set forth in this document. To be maximally useful to the candidate and the department, the review shall involve the entire tenured faculty. In order for it to accurately reveal the judgment of tenured faculty, it shall conclude with a vote on whether or not, in the judgment of the tenured faculty, the candidate is making appropriate progress toward tenure. The result of the vote shall be announced at the meeting. Faculty should understand that this vote is not a commitment to grant or deny tenure in the future.

The head shall prepare a written report covering the findings of the review, and characterizing the nature of the vote. The procedure described above for the report on the yearly conference shall be followed, with the difference that this report may be consulted by the tenured faculty when the faculty member is a candidate for tenure; otherwise, the report is to remain confidential [to the extent allowable by law].

See Appendix 5 for Departmental Third-Year Review Guidelines.

Promotion and Tenure Review

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

Promotion is based on merit. A candidate for promotion should have acceptable achievements in the areas of 1) teaching and/or outreach and 2) research/creative work. He or she is further expected to demonstrate over a sustained period distinctive achievement in one of these areas or achievement in both areas comparable to that of successful candidates in the discipline in the past five years. In addition, he or she is expected to have contributed some service to the University. Candidates covered by Provost approved departmental promotion and tenure guidelines will be evaluated accordingly. For candidates not covered by Provost approved departmental promotion and tenure guidelines, the criteria for teaching, research/creative work, and outreach described below [see Appendix 1] shall be considered by the faculty in the evaluation of a candidate's performance and achievement. The candidate's employment conditions and academic assignments shall determine which criteria are most emphasized, and standards for promotion are based on the weights of each performance area as described in the letter of offer and subsequent annual evaluations. Credit shall also be given for contributions above and beyond specifically assigned duties.

Appendix 1 outlines the university's expectations for teaching, research, outreach, and service.

Regarding tenure, the AU Faculty Handbook states:

Auburn University nurtures and defends the concept of academic tenure which assures each faculty member freedom, without jeopardy at the department, college or school, or University level, to criticize and advocate changes in existing theories, beliefs, programs, policies, and institutions and guarantees faculty members the right to support, without jeopardy, any colleague whose academic freedom is threatened. Tenure establishes an environment in which truth can be sought and expressed in one's teaching, research/creative work, outreach work, and service. In addition to demonstrating quality in the areas of 1) teaching, 2) research/creative work, 3) outreach and 4) service as described above under Promotion Criteria and, where applicable, in approved departmental guidelines, the candidate for tenure must also demonstrate potential to contribute as a productive and collegial member of the academic unit in all relevant areas.

Candidates for promotion and tenure should carefully read the Promotion and Tenure policies found in the AU Faculty Handbook. A timeline for the candidate's submission of materials for evaluation for promotion and tenure will be established each year by the Office of the Provost.

See Appendix 6 for Departmental Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.

Post-Tenure Review

Tenured faculty at Auburn are subject to post-tenure review as outlined on the Provost's website at the following URL: http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/policies/2009-11_post-tenured-review-policy.pdf

**Appendix 1**

**Auburn University's Expectations for Teaching, Research, Outreach, and Service**


**Teaching**
The AU Faculty Handbook states:

> Since a primary activity of the University is the instruction of students, careful evaluation of teaching is essential. Because of the difficulty of evaluating teaching effectiveness, faculty members are urged to consider as many relevant measures as possible in appraising the candidate. These include consideration of the candidate's knowledge of the subject and his or her professional growth in the field of specialization; the candidate's own statement of his or her teaching philosophy; the quality of the candidate's teaching as indicated by peer and student evaluations and teaching awards; performance of the candidate's students on standardized tests or in subsequent classes; the candidate's contributions to the academic advising of students; the candidate's development of new courses and curricula; the quality of the candidate's direction of dissertations, theses, independent study projects, etc.; and the quality of pedagogical material published by the candidate.

**Research/Creative Work**
The AU Faculty Handbook states:

> A faculty member engaged in research/creative work has an obligation to contribute to his or her discipline through applied and/or basic research, through creative endeavors, or through interpretive scholarship. To a large extent, each discipline and each department must determine how much and what quality of research/creative work is appropriate for promotion (and/or tenure) and judge its candidates accordingly. In appraising the candidate's work, faculty members should consider the quality and significance of the work, the quality of the outlet for publication or exhibition, and, in cases of collaborative work, the role of the candidate.
>
> Research and creative work ordinarily can be documented by a candidate's publications or performances/exhibitions. Publication subjected to critical review by other scholars as a condition of publication should carry more weight than publication that is not refereed. Nevertheless, all forms of publication, including articles intended for a non-academic audience, should be considered provided they are of high quality in relation to the purpose intended. Scholarly papers subjected to peer review and delivered at a regional or national conference and creative work subjected to peer review and performed or exhibited on a regional or national level should carry more weight than work done only on a local level.
> Successful efforts in obtaining extramural support for research/creative work (as well as for teaching and outreach programs) should also be positively considered in evaluation of the candidate.

**Outreach**
The AU Faculty Handbook states:

> Outreach refers to the function of applying academic expertise to the direct benefit of external audiences in support of university and unit missions. A faculty endeavor may be regarded as outreach scholarship for purposes of tenure and promotion if all the following conditions are met: 1) there is a substantive link with significant human needs and societal problems, issues or concerns; 2) there is a direct application of knowledge to significant human needs and societal problems, issues, or concerns; 3) there is utilization of the faculty member's academic and professional expertise; 4) the ultimate purpose is for the public or common good; 5) new knowledge is generated for the discipline and/or the audience or clientele; and 6) there is a clear link/relationship between the program/activities and an appropriate academic unit's mission. Outreach is not expected

of all faculty. Participation in this function varies from major, continuing commitments, as is the case with the Alabama Cooperative Extension System, through intermittent engagement for individual faculty as needs and opportunities for a particular expertise arise, to no involvement at all.

The commitment of faculty time to outreach is a decision to be made by the faculty member with the approval of the department in which the faculty member will seek tenure and/or promotion. It may be accomplished in the initial appointment, as is typically the case for Extension faculty, in annual work plans, or during the year in response to unexpected needs. In any case, this decision should be made with due consideration to the professional development of the faculty member, the expected public benefits of the outreach activities, and mission of the department and/or other supporting units. Departmental approval carries a commitment to assess and appropriately weigh outreach contributions in salary, tenure, and promotion recommendations.

Demands for quality in outreach are the same as in teaching and research/creative work; however, outreach activities are different in nature from other activities and must be evaluated accordingly. See Appendix 1 of Faculty Participation in Outreach Scholarship: An Assessment Model, which is available along with other publications on the assessment of outreach under "Outreach Publications" on the University web site. Department heads should request any material necessary from the candidate to facilitate faculty assessment of the type, quality, and effectiveness of the candidate's involvement in extension activities and evaluation of any resulting publications.

**Service**

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

University service includes participating in departmental, college or school, and University governance and committee work, assisting in the recruitment of new faculty, and developing and assisting in the implementation of new academic programs. Faculty should note particularly distinctive contributions to University life on the part of the candidate, including service to the candidate's profession, such as offices held and committee assignments performed for professional associations and learned societies; and editorships and the refereeing of manuscripts.

**Appendix 2**

**Departmental Workload Guidelines for Tenure-Track Faculty**

The workload guidelines for the Department of Political Science follow the guidelines set forth herein by the College of Liberal Arts.

# Appendix 3

## Workload Distribution and Performance Review Chart

| DEPARTMENT (insert name here) | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Faculty | Instruction | | Research | | Outreach | | Service | | Administrative | | TOTAL SCORE |
| Name | Workload % | Performance Score | Workload % | Performance Score | Workload % | Performance Score | Workload % | Performance Score | Workload % | Performance Score | |
| *Example* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dr. X | *0.63* | *4* | *0.25* | *3* | *0.07* | *3* | *0.05* | *3* | *0* | *0* | *3.63* |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | Performance Score/Criteria | | | | |
| | | | | | | | **0** | **Unacceptable** | | | |
| | | | | | | | **1** | **Marginal** | | | |
| | | | | | | | **2** | **Meets expectations** | | | |
| | | | | | | | **3** | **Exceeds expectations** | | | |
| | | | | | | | **4** | **Exemplary** | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

**Appendix 4**

**Departmental Annual Review Guidelines**

**Research**

General Principles:  A faculty member engaged in research work has an obligation to contribute to his or her discipline through applied and/or basic research or through interpretive scholarship. In assessing the departmental member's annual performance, the Chair shall consider the quality and significance of the work, the quality of the outlet for publication or presentation and, in cases of collaborative work, the role of the faculty member.

Research and creative work ordinarily can be documented by the faculty member's publications or presentations. Publication subjected to critical review by other scholars as a condition of publication should carry more weight than publication that is not refereed. Scholarly papers subjected to peer review and delivered at a regional or national conference and creative work subjected to peer review and performed or exhibited on a regional or national level should carry more weight than work done only on a local level. Successful efforts in obtaining extramural support for research/creative work should also be positively considered in the annual assessment of the faculty member.

## Research will be evaluated using the following scale:

| | |
|---|---|
| Exemplary: | 4 |
| Exceeds Expectations: | 3 |
| Meets Expectations: | 2 |
| Marginal: | 1 |
| Unacceptable: | 0 |

To meet research expectations (i.e. "2"), a faculty member should be engaged in research activities equivalent to two (2) published research articles over a three year period. It is the responsibility of the faculty member in the annual report to explain and document research accomplishments to the Chair. The Department recognizes that measurement of individual research performance may not coincide with the calendar year, and that accommodation to the cumulative nature of research endeavors should be taken into account in the annual evaluation.

It is understood that non-tenured, tenure-track faculty with a research workload allocation exceeding 25% should not be held to a research performance standard higher than that outlined in the tenure and promotion guidelines. For all other faculty members who have workload allocations that are substantively higher or lower than twenty-five percent (25%), the Chair should endeavor to adjust research performance expectations to correspond to the faculty member's individual workload allocation for research.

It is the responsibility of the faculty member in the annual report to the Chair to make the case for inclusion in each workload category, as well as to justify the relative contribution or weight of the activity to each category. It is the responsibility of the Chair to provide each faculty member with a preliminary draft copy of the annual evaluation, and to allow sufficient time (e.g. 10 business days) for the faculty member to comment upon and provide additional documentation as may be needed. There is no prohibition for a faculty member to concurrently apply, but not double count, an activity to more than one workload category (e.g. research and outreach).

<u>Guidelines:</u>

- Depending upon the preference of the faculty member, credit for publication can be given upon formal written acceptance by the editor of the journal, or in the year of publication.

- For book or other projects that involve multiple years, two to three years credit may be granted. Depending upon the preference of the faculty member, credit does not need to be granted during consecutive years. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to make the case for the number of years of credit and scholarly contribution of the work in the annual report to the Chair.

- The faculty member and Chair determine the appropriateness of allocation of credit for publications that may also fall under the teaching or outreach standards. Publications relating to teaching or outreach may be viewed partially, or wholly, as a research activity for the purpose of the annual review process. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to make the case for inclusion and its relative scholarly contribution in the annual report to the Chair.

- Electronic books and journals are counted as scholarly research work according to the same standards as printed books and journals. The assessment criteria and evaluation depend upon the review process conducted by the publisher/journal editor and whether the publication is a recognized scholarly publication. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to make the case for inclusion and scholarly contribution in the annual report to the Chair.

- A reasonable effort needs to be made to reach an assessment of the quality of the journal. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to make the case for inclusion and scholarly contribution in the annual report to the Chair.

- To assess the quality of conference papers and conference participation, a reasonable effort should be made to reach an assessment of the quality and importance of the conference/assembly. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to make the case for inclusion and scholarly contribution in the annual report to the Chair.

- A book review or essay is generally considered to be a professional service activity and is allocated to the professional service component of the faculty workload distribution. In some instances, a book review may be counted as a research activity. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to make the case for inclusion and scholarly contribution in the annual report to the Chair.

- An applied research publication is generally considered to be a research activity and is allocated to the research component of the faculty workload distribution. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to make the case for inclusion and its scholarly contribution in the annual report to the Chair.

- An outreach publication is generally considered to be an outreach activity and is allocated to the outreach component of the faculty workload distribution. In some instances, an outreach publication may be assessed as a scholarly research activity. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to make the case for inclusion and scholarly contribution in the annual report to the Chair.

- For annual performance reviews, faculty are required to submit the information on co-authored works that is listed in Section 3.2.B. of the *Faculty Handbook.* The relative contribution of the faculty member to the co-authored publications will be taken into account in the performance evaluation.

- For research grant awards, differentiation should be made between internal university and external grant proposals as well as the competitive nature of the award. For external agency awards, the prestige of the granting agency program should be taken into consideration as well as the funding level of the award. Credit for research grant awards may be given for each year of the active grant award project. For multi-investigator awards, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to make the case for inclusion, relative contribution to the research effort, and scholarly contribution in the annual report to the Chair.

**Teaching**

<u>Acknowledgment</u>
*The Faculty Handbook* acknowledges teaching as the (a) primary activity in the university.  As such, research and outreach, while of the immeasurable value to the university, are essentially in the service of teaching.

<u>Presumptions and Inferences</u>:
- Each tenured faculty member appraised for teaching proficiency is rebuttably presumed to satisfy the "Meets Expectations" classification, as designated in the five evaluative categories.  It is the obligation of the moving party to present evidence designed to enhance or diminish that presumed appraisal.  Once evidence is presented, the presumption is rebutted.
- Each tenure-track faculty member (hereinafter defined as tenured and untenured) should receive an overall annual teaching evaluation that meets expectations.  Allowances shall be made for such members who have demonstrated improvement in their teaching evaluations over time or who have taken affirmative steps to improve their teaching appraisals, e.g., completing the Biggio Center's New Faculty Scholar Program or related courses.
- Factors delineated as enhancing an appraisal of teaching proficiency will not necessarily diminish an appraisal in their absence.
- While all faculty members are encouraged to have peer evaluations of their teaching conducted annually, probationary faculty are expected to have annual peer evaluations.  Candidates for promotion to full professor are expected to have peer evaluations done for at least the three years prior to the candidacy for promotion.

<u>Categories for Appraising Teaching Proficiency</u>, from highest to lowest.
- Exemplary           :   3.5 - 4.0
- Exceeds Exceptions   :   2.5 - 3.4
- Meets Expectations   :   1.5 - 2.4
- Marginal            :   0.5 - 1.4
- Unacceptable :          0.0 - 0.4

IV.   <u>General Conditions Satisfying Evaluative Categories for Teaching Proficiency</u>
   A)   Exemplary:
      1.   Student evaluations of teaching with comments, between 3.5 and 4.0.
      2.   Peer evaluations of teaching, the remarks of which are the equivalent of 3.5 to 4.0.

      Additional Conditions.   See sections V.- VII.

   B)   Exceeds Expectations:
      1.   Student Evaluations of teaching with comments, between 2.5 and 3.4.
      2.   Peer evaluations of teaching, the comments of which are the equivalent of 2.5 to 3.4.
      Additional Conditions.   See sections V.-V11.

   C)   Meets Expectations:
      1.   Student evaluations of teaching with comments, between 1.5 and 2.4.
      2.   Peer evaluations of teaching the comments of which are the equivalent of 1.5 to 2.4.
      Additional Conditions.  See sections V.-V11.

   D)   Marginal :
      1.   Student evaluations of teaching with comments, between 0.5 and 1.4.
      2.   Peer evaluations of teaching the comments of which are the equivalent of 0.5 to 1.4.
      Additional Conditions.  See sections V.-V11.

E)  Unacceptable:
    1.  Student evaluations of teaching, with comments, between 0.0 and 0.4.
    2.  Peer evaluations of teaching, the comments of which are the equivalent to 0.0 and 0.4.
    Additional Conditions.  See sections V.-V11.

Factors That Enhance the Appraisal of Teaching Performance Beyond the Level of Presumption.  By Way
    of Illustration, not Limitation:
A)  Student evaluation of teaching, the average of the accumulative value of which exceeds 2.4.
B)  Peer evaluation of teaching the equivalent value of which exceeds 2.4.
C)  Teaching awards and honors:
    1.  Titled Professorship Based Upon Teaching = 4.0
    2.  Academic Discipline Award = 4.0
    3.  National Award = 4.0
    4.  State Award = 4.0
    5.  University Award = 4.0
    6.  College Award = 3.75
    7.  Department Award = 3.5
D)  Independent studies = 3.5.
E)  Faculty academic subject and pedagogical published research = 3.5 to 4.0.
F)  Faculty instructions supplements - distance learning, online = 3.5 to 4.0
G)  Faculty advising, contribution to graduate committees, peer reviewed in excess of 2.5.
H)  Directing Ph.D. and M.P.A. studies = 3.5 and higher.
I)  Faculty education in the academic subject(s) or in instruction = 2.5 and higher.
    Examples of courses and activities a member might engage to enhance instruction.
    1.  Attending Biggio Center courses.
    2.  Completing the College of Liberal Arts, Summer Academy.
    3.  Teaching courses in: Human Odyssey, Women Studies, Africana Studies, Community and
        Civic Engagement Minor.
    4.  Teaching a designated writing course.
    5.  Incorporating instructional technologies in the classroom.
J)  Favorable reports from alumni attesting to teaching proficiency =2.5 and higher.
K)  Favorable reports from former student and alumni concerning their performance in subsequent
    classes, standardized exams, graduate and professional school and careers = 2.5 and higher.
L)  Serving on University and College committees designed to promote and/or recognize
    excellence and/or innovation in teaching = 2.5 and higher.  By way of illustration only:
    1.  Promoting Excellence in Teaching and Learning Committee (PETL Committee).
    2.  College Distance Education Committee.

Factors That Diminish the Presumed Appraisal of Teaching Performance By Way of Illustration:
A)  Student evaluation of teaching the accumulative value of which is less than 1.5.
B)  Peer evaluation of teaching the accumulative equivalent value of which is less than 1.5.
C)  Persistent violation of student rights.
D)  Chronic unexcused absences from class.
E)  Continued failure to perform required teaching duties.

Considerations Favorable in Teaching Evaluations:
    The absence of these factors do not count against the member.  By way of illustration:
A)  Large classes.
B)  Early and late classes.
C)  Lower division classes.
D)  Required classes.
E)  Heavy service, advising and outreach. (e.g., beyond reasonable, percentage allocation)
F)  Heavy research output. (e.g., beyond reasonable, percentage allocation)
G)  Willingness to engage controversial topics especially in controversial times.
H)  Willingness to help the department by teaching necessary courses or additional courses.
I)  Class taught for the first time.

<u>Recommendation</u>:

A)  1.  Each tenured faculty member shall undergo student teaching evaluations at least once during the academic year.

    2.  The annual evaluation of teaching based upon student evaluations shall be based upon the average of the accumulative result of all student evaluations conducted if more than one is conducted.

B).  1.  Each untenured tenure-track faculty member shall undergo student teaching evaluations in at least one class each semester.

    2.  The annual teaching evaluations will be based upon the average of the accumulative result of all student teaching evaluations conducted.

C)  1.  Each non-tenured tenure-track faculty member shall undergo peer teaching evaluation at least once during the academic year.

    2.  Each tenured tenured faculty member shall undergo peer evaluation of teaching each of three years prior to seeking promotion.

    3.  If not seeking promotion, tenured faculty members should undergo peer evaluation of teaching every year but not fewer than once every three years.

    4.  Faculty members may choose the peer reviewer but in no case may:
        a.  A tenured faculty member pick a non-tenured faculty reviewer.
        b.  A faculty member of lesser academic rank review a higher ranked member.
        c.  A faculty member serve as a peer reviewer for the same faculty member more than two consecutive years.
        d.  A faculty member serving as a peer reviewer for someone who is serving as his or her peer reviewer simultaneously.

    5.  Peer evaluation may also conducted by the Biggio Center.

    6.  Items to be considered in peer review.
        a.  Class preparation, presentation and interaction with students.
        b.  The scope and depth of the class.
        c.  The course syllabus coverage.
        d.  Tests and other material.
        e.  Visitation.

    7.  Peer review evaluations are to be completed and given to the reviewer within one week of the class visit.  Both reviewer and reviewee will sign and present the evaluation to the Chair within ten working days of the class visit.

    8.  The reviewer is entitled to submit a response to the review that must be weighed against the review in the light of cogent and empirically based arguments.

D)  Students evaluations based not on the merits of teaching but expressly or implicitly upon illegitimate, collateral considerations, e.g., racism, gender bias, agism, prejudice against the manner of speech, shall not be counted in the member's evaluation.


**Service**

<u>Preface</u>:  Service encompasses a range of activities that may or may not draw on a faculty member's academic expertise.  For example, service to academic organizations may include reviewing articles for journals, which requires professional expertise.  It may also include planning a convention or serving as an academic association officer or committee member.  Service to the department, college or university may involve devoting time in a capacity not related to expertise.  All such activities are considered service regardless of whether they rely on expertise.

<u>Assessment</u>:  Service will be evaluated using the following scale:

| | |
|---|---|
| Exemplary: | 4 |
| Exceeds Expectations: | 3 |
| Meets Expectations: | 2 |
| Marginal: | 1 |
| Unacceptable   : | 0 |

Requirements for achieving the ratings above:
- Exemplary: Excellent contributions to the department, college, university, or profession, as evidenced by their quality, number, responsibilities, time requirements, or significance. Specifically, to achieve a rating of "exemplary" faculty members must perform one or more activities from the lists below totaling FOUR points.
- Exceeds Expectations: Very good contributions to the department, college, university, or profession, as evidenced by their quality, number, responsibilities, time requirements, or significance. Specifically, to achieve a rating of "exceeds expectations" faculty members must perform one or more activities from the lists below totaling THREE points.
- Meets Expectations: Average contributions to the department, college, university, or profession. Specifically, to achieve a rating of "meets expectations" faculty members must perform one or more activities from the lists below totaling TWO points.
- Marginal: Limited contributions to the department, college, university, or profession. Specifically, to achieve a rating of "marginal" faculty members must perform one activity from the lists below meriting ONE point.
- Unacceptable: No contribution to the department, college, university, or profession.

Activities:
- Activities Meriting Four points
  - Chairing a university search committee
  - Organizing a regional, national, or international conference
- Activities Meriting Three Points
  - Chairing a departmental search committee
  - Serving as an officer or member of the executive board of a regional, national, or international professional organization;
  - Organizing a student trip to an out-of-town learning event;
  - Organizing a state conference
- Activities Meriting Two points
  - Serving as a University Senator
  - Membership on a departmental search committee;
  - Serving in a substantial ad hoc capacity to the department, the college, or the university;
  - Nominating a student for a major college, university, or national honor or award;
  - Serving as faculty advisor to an honor society or student organization;
  - Creating an internship;
  - Organizing a panel at a regional, national, or international conference;
  - Organizing a lecture series or other departmental function involving students or colleagues;
  - Organizing a series of special departmental professional activities;
  - Arranging for a speaker of national or international reputation to present a campus-wide lecture;
  - Membership on the editorial board of an academic journal;
  - Consultant to an academic press having reviewed at least one book manuscript;
  - Receiving an award specifically for service from a professional organization;
  - Nominating a colleague for a major college, university, or national honor or award
- Activities Meriting One Point
  - Serving as a committee member in a regional, national, or international organization;
  - Membership on a departmental, college, or university committee;
  - Serving as a peer reviewer for a faculty member;
  - Reviewing a tenure and/or promotion dossier at another academic institution;
  - Arranging an internship for one student;
  - Mentoring students in the context of a specific program, such as themed learning communities or the seamless admission program;
  - Organizing a special departmental professional activity;
  - Serving as a reader for an academic journal, having reviewed one article;

- o Giving a lecture at another university.

- Activities listed above may count for additional points if faculty members can provide compelling reasons for doing so in their annual reports in the form of evidence that in the particular instance being reported the service activity involved substantially more than the typical quality, responsibilities, time requirements, or significance for that kind of activity.
- It is understood that non-tenured, tenure-track faculty with a service workload allocation exceeding 6.25% should not be held to a service performance standard higher than that outlined in the tenure and promotion guidelines. For all other faculty members who have workload allocations that are substantially higher or lower than 6.25%, the Chair should endeavor to adjust service performance expectations to correspond to the faculty member's individual workload allocation for service.

**Outreach**

Preface: Outreach refers to the function of applying academic expertise to the direct benefit of external audiences in support of university and unit missions. Consult the *Faculty Handbook* for specific guidelines of what constitutes outreach for promotion and tenure consideration.

As opposed to service, outreach scholarship relies profoundly on expertise and represents focused and coordinated efforts toward planning and achieving a specific outreach program. Generally, outreach serves an external non-academic audience as opposed to an academic association. "External non-academic audience" may refer to a geographic region, such as a city, county, or state, or may refer to a social or professional community, such as "high school teachers" or "media professionals." For the purpose of outreach, a specific "audience" must be served. But what constitutes an "audience" should be viewed broadly.

Assessment: Outreach will be evaluated using the following scale:

Exemplary:               4
Exceeds Expectations:    3
Meets Expectations:      2
Marginal:                1
Unacceptable    :        0

Requirements for achieving the ratings above:
- Exemplary: Excellent contributions to external audiences as evidenced by their quality, number, originality, responsibilities, time requirements, or significance. Specifically, to achieve a rating of "exemplary" faculty members must perform one or more activities from the lists below totaling FOUR points.
- Exceeds Expectations: Very good contributions to external audiences as evidenced by their quality, number, originality responsibilities, time requirements, or significance. Specifically, to achieve a rating of "exceeds expectations" faculty members must perform one or more activities from the lists below totaling THREE points.
- Meets Expectations: Average contributions to external audiences. Specifically, to achieve a rating of "meets expectations" faculty members must perform one or more activities from the lists below totaling TWO points.
- Marginal: Limited contributions to external audiences. Specifically, to achieve a rating of "marginal" faculty members must perform one activity from the lists below meriting ONE point.
- Unacceptable: No contribution to external audiences.

Activities:
- Activities Meriting Four Points:
    - o Creating an outreach program;

- o Obtaining a university-wide, state, national, or international outreach award.
- Activities Meriting Three Points:
  - o Teaching off-campus (such as at a high school) or to a non-university audience (such as for Elderhostel or the National Election Center).
  - o Creating a website for the purpose of sharing professional expertise with the public;
  - o Serving as an officer or member of the executive board of a local, state, national, or international non-academic organization requiring professional expertise.
- Activities Meriting Two Points:
  - o Making a presentation to an out-of-town group;
  - o Maintaining a website that was created for the purpose of sharing professional expertise with the public;
  - o Consultation with local, state, or national government or non-academic organizations requiring professional expertise.
- Activities Meriting One Point:
  - o Making a presentation to a local group;
  - o Service to a high school activity requiring professional expertise.

- Activities listed above may count for additional points if faculty members can provide compelling reasons for doing so in their annual reports in the form of evidence that in the particular instance being reported the outreach activity involved substantially more than the typical quality, responsibilities, time requirements, or significance for that kind of activity.

- It is understood that non-tenured, tenure-track faculty with an outreach workload allocation exceeding 6.25% should not be held to an outreach performance standard higher than that outlined in the tenure and promotion guidelines. For all other faculty members who have workload allocations that are substantially higher or lower than 6.25%, the Chair should endeavor to adjust outreach performance expectations to correspond to the faculty member's individual workload allocation for outreach.

An unfavorable annual review for tenure-track faculty may result in the issuance of a letter of non-continuation at any time prior to tenure.

**Appendix 5**

**Departmental Third-Year Review Guidelines**


The Third-Year Review Guidelines of the Department of Political Science follow the guidelines and procedures set forth in the *Faculty Handbook*. It is highly recommended that the third-year review dossier follow the Promotion and Tenure format contained in the *Faculty Handbook*.

An unfavorable third-year review may result in the issuance of a letter of non-continuation; however, a letter of non-continuation may be issued at any time prior to tenure.

**Appendix 6**

**Departmental Promotion and Tenure Guidelines**

**Associate Professor**

Associate professor is a rank of distinction which is attained through successful performance of assigned duties. A candidate should hold the appropriate terminal degree (usually a doctorate) or the equivalent. Faculty should consult the *Faculty Handbook* for requirements of time in service. Probationary faculty who do not have prior service at another institution of higher education generally come up for promotion and tenure review in their fifth year at Auburn. Although this is not a requirement and faculty may seek tenure and promotion at any time before their sixth year if they have met departmental promotion and tenure standards, they *must* come up for tenure and promotion by their sixth year of appointment (except in the case of documented FMLA leave or leave without pay, as described in the *Faculty Handbook*).

A candidate for associate professor should have demonstrated mastery of the subject matter of his or her field and the ability to apply it well in the primary area(s) to which he or she is assigned whether in teaching, research/creative work, or outreach. Additionally, the candidate should have contributed, typically through significant scholarly or creative work, to his or her area of specialization; participated in professional life; and served on departmental, college or school, and/or University committees. Through his or her scholarly and professional activity, the candidate should demonstrate an emerging stature as a regional, national, or international authority. The candidate should work collaboratively and cooperatively with other faculty in the areas of teaching, research, service and outreach.

Section 11.C.3.E. of the *Faculty Handbook* requires that the research of candidates for promotion be evaluated by at least three external reviewers. In addition to the standards that are articulated in the *Faculty Handbook*, reviewers will be asked specifically to address the scholarly significance of the candidate's research program as indicated by, for example, journal quality, seminality of the research program, and suitability of the candidate to direct graduate student research

The standard in research for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with Tenure should be some combination of:

      1. The total of seven (7) peer-reviewed articles in recognized scholarly journals or edited book chapters published by university or scholarly press publishers; or

      2. An authored or co-authored peer-reviewed book published by a recognized university or scholarly press publisher, plus one peer-reviewed article; or

      3. Authorship or co-authorship of a research report or study prepared and submitted to the sponsoring agency as part of a funded research contract with the University may be considered as equivalent to a peer-reviewed article in Standard 1; or

      4. Other publications (e.g., book chapters, invited publications, essays, etc.) equivalent to Standard 1.

Upon meeting this standard, there is a rebuttable presumption that the candidate will have met the research expectation for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

Peer-reviewed publications may be in electronic or print format.

Both single- and co-authored publications count toward the minimum number of publications for promotion and tenure. The relative contribution to each publication is taken into account.

**Full Professor**

Professor is a rank requiring professional peer-recognition of the individual as an authority in his or her field of specialization. A candidate must be recognized by associates as a capable teacher, scholar or artist, or outreach specialist. It is therefore expected that peers within and outside the University will attest to the candidate's high professional standing. A candidate should hold the appropriate terminal degree (usually a doctorate) or the equivalent. Faculty should consult the *Faculty Handbook* for requirements of time in service for promotion to Full Professor.

A candidate for professor should have demonstrated significant involvement in the teaching, research/creative work, or the outreach functions of the University. He or she should also have participated in professional life and have been actively involved in departmental, college or school, and University affairs. For this rank, it is essential that the candidate should have demonstrated a marked degree of scholarship appropriate to his or her assignment through work, typically publication or creative endeavor, subjected to peer review. By means of such activity, a candidate for the University's highest academic rank should have a respected national and/or international reputation. The candidate should work collaboratively and cooperatively with other faculty in the areas of teaching, research, service and outreach.

The standard for consideration of promotion to Full Professor should be a record of research publication beyond the Associate level rank decision. The publication "count" includes all publications, not just those since promotion to associate professor. Total publications should be equivalent to or exceed some combination of:

      1. Fourteen (14) peer-reviewed articles in national/international level scholarly journals or edited book chapters published by university or scholarly press publishers; or

      2. Two authored or co-authored peer-reviewed books published by recognized university or scholarly press publishers, plus two peer-reviewed articles; or

      3. Authorship or co-authorship of a research report or study prepared and submitted as part of a funded research contract with the University may be considered as equivalent to a peer-reviewed article in Standard 1.

      4. Other publications (e.g., book chapters, invited publications, essays, etc.) equivalent to Standard 1.

Upon meeting this standard, there is a rebuttable presumption that the candidate will have met the research publication expectations for promotion to the rank of Full Professor.

Peer-reviewed publications may be in electronic or print format.

Both single- and co-authored publications count toward the minimum number of publications for promotion and tenure. The relative contribution to each publication is taken into account.

Approved by faculty.
Revised November 2012.