

Department of Political Science Sustained Performance Evaluation (SPE) Criteria

Criteria:

The Political Science Department Promotion and Tenure criteria shall be used for the SPE. The Department's Promotion and Tenure Criteria are attached as Appendix A to this document.

Process:

In line with section I of the Provost's SPE Policy, governing the establishment of College-wide evaluation policies, an ad hoc SPE committee will be formed annually within the Department consisting of all tenured faculty. Only tenured associate professors and professors are eligible to vote on SPE of associate professors. Only full professors are eligible to vote on SPE of full professors. The College has a College Performance Review Committee in place should a faculty member disagree with the Department-level committee.

The SPE will be conducted based on a file containing a brief summary of the faculty member's activities during the entire seven-year period under review. The file should contain:

- a current curriculum vita that clearly highlights accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service during the period under review,
- copies of the faculty member's last seven annual assignments and annual evaluations,
- a copy of the report of the previous SPE, if available,
- a copy of the published performance expectations from the faculty member's academic unit, and
- a brief (2 page) narrative from the faculty member.

Ratings:

Consistent rating of a faculty member on annual evaluations as 'exceptional' (score 5) and 'outstanding' (score 4) (with occasional deviations) provides sufficient evidence for

scoring that faculty member's performance as 'Exceeding Expectations' (average score of 3.5 and above on annual evaluations for the SPE evaluation period) on SPE.

Consistent annual evaluation rankings of 'good' (score 3) with occasional downward deviations is sufficient for assigning a value of 'Meets Expectations' on SPE (average score of 2.5 and above, but below 3.5 on annual evaluations for the SPE evaluation period).

Annual performance evaluation of 'unsatisfactory' (2) and 'needs improvement' (1) may be used as a base for evaluating a faculty member's SPE performance as 'Failing to Meet Expectations' (average score below 2.5 on annual evaluations for the SPE evaluation period).

Faculty members may choose whether they will be evaluated based on research, teaching, or service routes or on their combination.

In addition to the departmental review of each SPE file in light of the department's published performance expectations, the Committee will consider:

- that faculty members have varying responsibilities within their academic units, as reflected in their annual assignments,
- that faculty can make essential contributions to the University's mission in various ways, include, but are not limited to, community engagement (broadly defined), service on advisory committees, government relations, and other non-traditional routes (to be determined by the academic expertise of the tenured faculty of the department).
- that the nature of an individual's contributions may vary over time,
- that innovative scholarly work may take time to bear fruit, and may sometimes fail, and
- that unusual or unpopular scholarship, teaching, and service are not by themselves sufficient cause for a negative evaluation.

Records:

The Department will maintain electronic copies of all SPE records.