

Department: Political Science

Department approved: February 25, 2015

CART review Date: May 8, 2015

Department revised: September 30, 2015

CART approved: October 9, 2015

Procedures for Evaluating Probationary Faculty in Political Science Department

I. Annual Review of Probationary Faculty

A. The classes of the probationary faculty member will be visited every semester beginning with the second semester of service by the Department Chair and at least one additional tenured member of the Department designated by the Chair. One of these designated tenured members of the Department shall conduct at least two evaluations of the same faculty member during the probationary period. Prior to the initiation of the formal classroom visit the probationary faculty member should provide a course syllabus for each class to be visited.

Within one day after each visit the probationary faculty member will inform the chair that the visit has taken place. Within one week after each visit the faculty member evaluating the course will produce a written evaluation that includes: An evaluation of the substantive quality of the course based on consideration of the syllabus, a description of the class session that was visited, and an evaluation of the presentation of information during the session. A copy of the evaluation of teaching performance will be given to the probationary faculty member within a week and a copy will be placed in the personnel file.

B. The Chair shall annually submit a written evaluation of performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service to the probationary faculty member. A copy of this evaluation shall be placed in the personnel file. Within two weeks of submitting the written evaluation, the Chair will meet with the probationary faculty member to discuss the contents of the evaluation.

II. Third Year Review

A thorough review of the probationary faculty member's record of teaching, scholarship, and service will be conducted by the tenured members of the department in the spring of the candidate's third contract year. During the semester in which the review occurs (normally the first semester of the third year of service) and prior to the review meeting described below, the probationary faculty member will make a scholarly presentation to the faculty and students of the department. Within one week of this presentation, the Chair or a designated tenured member will provide the probationary faculty member a written critique of the presentation. The third year review will include an evaluation of teaching, scholarship, and service based on materials normally considered in making a

tenure decision. Tenured members of the department will review these materials and discuss the candidates performance in a meeting presided over by the Chair, and will also vote by secret ballot on whether the candidate is making adequate progress towards tenure. Following the meeting the Chair will produce a summary of the discussion, and will submit it for the approval of all members present. Once the accuracy of the summary has been approved by all, the Chair will provide a copy to the probationary faculty member, along with the results of the vote. This will occur no later than May 1.

III. The Tenure Recommendation

Faculty eligible for tenure consideration are informed in writing by September 1 of the sixth year of the probationary period. Faculty members eligible for a tenure decision have the opportunity to submit material to the Department and through the Provost to the Committee on Academic Rank and Tenure (CART), by January 15 of the sixth year of service. It is the responsibility of the Chair and the Department to evaluate the performance of the tenure candidate in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service and to maintain records of this performance for the purposes of evaluation by tenured members of the Department. During the fall semester prior to tenure consideration (normally the first semester of the sixth year of service), the probationary faculty member will make an oral presentation of scholarly research to the faculty and students of the department.

Candidates will provide up to five names of professional colleagues for purposes of external review, by November 15. The Chair, at his/her discretion, will solicit from at least three of those colleagues an assessment, based upon a review of the candidate's publications, of the professional quality and contribution of the candidate's scholarship. In addition the Chair may, at his/her discretion, solicit testimony from an external reviewer not included on the candidate's list. All external assessments will be submitted directly from reviewers to the Chair.

- A. The tenured members of the Department shall attend a meeting by February 1, presided over by the Chair, to receive and discuss information contained in the electronic dossier that the candidate has submitted. In addition to the material included in the dossier, the department will consider information, written and oral, relating to the probationary faculty member from:
1. The probationary faculty member (who may choose to address the tenured members at the beginning of the meeting);
 2. Students;
 3. Untenured members of the Department;
 4. The Chair, in particular the letters from external reviewers and copies of annual evaluations of the probationary faculty member.

The Chair will forward to the Dean and to CART all supplementary written material considered at the meeting and summaries of any oral testimony will be included in the overall discussion summary under C (below).

- B. A vote will be conducted, by secret ballot with no absentee ballots allowed, regarding the candidate's performance in each area. Within five days following the meeting, the Chair shall inform the candidate of the department's recommendation to CART (i.e., whether it was positive or negative in each area).
- C. The Chair will produce a summary of the discussion, and will submit it for the approval of all members present. This summary is separate from the Chair's own recommendation letter and the overall tenure recommendation of the tenured members.
- D. By February 15, once the accuracy of the summary has been approved by all, the Chair will submit it, along with the ballots and the Chair's personal recommendation, to the Dean of Arts and Sciences.

IV. The candidate is responsible for preparing his or her own application for tenure including supporting materials, using the following criteria as a guide:

Criteria Used for Evaluation of Teaching

Successful Teaching: Characteristics of Successful Teaching Include:

- A. Knowledge Grasp of the subject material.
- B. Preparation and Organization Constructing detailed course outlines and syllabi, establishing course objectives, and defining evaluation procedures. Also day to day lessons are carefully prepared and organized with a definite plan for each lesson.
- C. Enthusiasm, Stimulation, and Clarity An infectiousness of attitudes toward the subject matter. The ability to stimulate interest and thinking about the subject matter. The teacher's skill of presentation, the ability to explain concepts, summarize major premises and present material in a systematic manner.
- D. Availability, Patience, and Tolerance Willingness to spend time with students inside and outside the classroom to explain concepts and listen to their views.
- E. Student Empowerment A commitment in one's teaching to empower students to become responsible for their own learning.

(The criteria above based on: Sherman, Thomas, et al (1987) "The Quest for Excellence

in University Teaching,” Journal of Higher Education 48 (January/February): 66-84.)

I. The Teaching Portfolio: It is recommended, but not required, that members of the Department of Political Science maintain a teaching portfolio that may be kept on file by the chairperson. The following may be contained in the portfolio (taken from Peter Seldin (1991) *The Teaching Portfolio* Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company).

A. Material from the faculty member that may be included in the teaching portfolio:

1. Statement of teaching responsibilities and a description of how each course is taught.
2. Representative course syllabi.
3. Description of steps taken to improve one’s teaching, including time spent reading journals as well as participation in workshops, seminars, and professional meetings devoted to teaching.
4. Descriptions of course revisions undertaken over time.
5. Publications or professional papers written and presented.
6. Information about honors theses directed and independent studies directed.

B. Material from others that may be included in the teaching portfolio:

1. Written evaluations by the chairperson and or colleagues who have observed the faculty member in the classroom.
2. Statements from colleagues who have systematically reviewed the faculty member’s classroom materials, course syllabi, evaluation procedures, text selection and reading lists.
3. Student course and teaching evaluation data.
4. Honors or recognition by colleagues such as teaching award.
5. Videotape of the faculty member teaching.
6. Letters from students concerning teaching.

C. Products of Good Teaching

1. Student publications or conference presentations that result from course related work.

Criteria Used to Evaluate Scholarship

I. Scholarship: The Political Science Department expects that its members will remain actively engaged in high quality scholarly research and publication, and the level of such activity will be considered in all tenure and promotion decisions. Scholarship will be evaluated in terms of continuing activity as well as the contribution of already completed scholarly activity, including both research and publishing. Evaluation will include judgments about the quality of all professional contributions. The relative weight of professional contributions will be assessed, in each individual case, through a process of

discussion and deliberation among eligible voters, who will consider these deliberations in forming their individual judgment. Those deliberating will not attempt to assign quantitative weights to an individual's scholarly contributions (such as ranking journals or presses). The department generally expects that the scholarly activity of a candidate for tenure will be reflected in blind peer-reviewed journal publications and/or scholarly books (either in press, or with final approval of the manuscript). For all co-authored work, the roles and responsibilities of the various authors should be made clear.

II. Professional Contribution: evidence of professional contribution could include peer-reviewed books, articles and book chapters.

Forms of scholarship that are not formally blind peer reviewed will also be taken into consideration but will not be sufficient in themselves for tenure. These other works, however, may be helpful in establishing the intellectual independence and future development of the member's research. They include:

- Published book chapters, articles, and book reviews
- Unpublished working papers, and papers presented at professional meetings

Scholarly contributions that are interdisciplinary in content, or that are published in non-Political Science venues, will be considered as equal to Political Science contributions with respect to scholarly achievement.

Criteria Used To Evaluate Service

As with the list of professional contributions above, the following rank ordered lists of service contributions are meant to be illustrative, but not exhaustive, of types of service contributions. Also, the rankings are illustrative of generally accepted levels of contribution, but they may vary in individual cases based on the quality or significance of particular contributions:

I. Department Service

Service as Department chair
Department assignments and chair of department committees
Department committee activity
Attendance at functions (lectures, seminars, receptions) sponsored by the Department

II. College Service

Faculty Senate officer
Academic program director or College administrative appointment
Chair of College and/or Faculty Senate committees
Faculty Senate membership
Service on College committees
Attendance at College sponsored academic events

III. Service to the Profession

Officer in a national or regional academic organization
Discussant or chair on a panel at a professional meeting
Review of a prospectus or grant proposal
Referee for a professional journal

IV. Service to the Community

Local speeches, newspaper op-ed pieces, televised interviews
Use of professional expertise for the benefit of the community or of a community organization

Department: Political Science

Department approved: February 17, 2016

CART approved: November 18, 2016

Procedures for Evaluating Faculty for Promotion to Full Professor in Political Science Department

I. The Recommendation for Promotion to Full Professor

Faculty members eligible for promotion to the rank of Full Professor have the opportunity to submit material to the Department and through the Provost to the Committee on Academic Rank and Tenure (CART), by June 15.

Candidates will provide up to five names of experts for purposes of external review, also by June 15. These experts should not be close associates of the candidate in either institutional or personal respects. The Chair, at his/her discretion, will solicit from at least three of these experts an assessment, based upon a review of the candidate's publications, of the professional quality and contribution of the candidate's scholarship. In addition the Chair may, at his/her discretion, solicit testimony from external reviewers not included on the candidate's list. All external assessments will be submitted directly from reviewers to the Chair.

E. Full Professors of the Department having at least two full years of service at Providence College shall attend a meeting prior to October 8, presided over by the Chair, to receive and discuss information contained in the electronic dossier that the candidate has submitted. In addition to the material included in the dossier, the department will consider information, written and oral, relating to the faculty member from:

2. The faculty member (who may choose to address the Full Professors at the beginning of the meeting);

2. Students;

3. Other members of the Department;

4. The Chair, in particular the letters from external reviewers.

The Chair will forward to CART all supplementary written material considered at the meeting and summaries of any oral testimony will be included in the overall discussion summary under C (below).

F. A vote will be conducted, by secret ballot with no absentee ballots allowed, regarding the candidate's performance in each area. Within five days following the meeting, the Chair shall inform the candidate of the Department's recommendation to CART (i.e., whether it was positive or negative in each area).

G. The Chair will produce a summary of the discussion, and will submit it for the approval of all members present, by October 10. This summary is separate from the Chair's own recommendation letter and the overall recommendation of the Full Professors.

H. By October 15, once the accuracy of the summary has been approved by all, the Chair will submit it, along with the ballots and the Chair's personal recommendation, to the Dean of Arts and Sciences.

IV. The candidate is responsible for preparing his or her own application for promotion including supporting materials, using the following criteria as a guide:

Criteria Used to Evaluate Scholarship

I. In evaluating applications for promotion to Full Professor, the Department places a premium on scholarship since promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. Scholarship will be evaluated in terms of continuing activity as well as the contribution of already completed scholarly activity, including both research and publishing. Evaluation will include judgments about the quality of all professional contributions. The relative weight of professional contributions will be assessed, in each individual case, through a process of discussion and deliberation among eligible voters, who will consider these deliberations in forming their individual judgment. Those deliberating will not attempt to assign quantitative weights to an individual's scholarly contributions (such as ranking journals or presses). The department generally expects that the scholarly activity of a candidate for promotion to Full Professor will be reflected in blind peer-reviewed journal

publications and/or scholarly books (either in press, or with final approval of the manuscript). For all co-authored work, the roles and responsibilities of the various authors should be made clear.

II. Professional Contribution: evidence of professional contribution could include peer-reviewed books, articles and book chapters.

Forms of scholarship that are not formally blind peer reviewed will also be taken into consideration but will not be sufficient in themselves for promotion. These other works, however, may be helpful in establishing the intellectual independence and future development of the member's research. They include:

- Published book chapters, articles, and book reviews
- Unpublished working papers, and papers presented at professional meetings

Scholarly contributions that are interdisciplinary in content, or that are published in non-Political Science venues, will be considered as equal to Political Science contributions with respect to scholarly achievement.

Criteria Used for Evaluation of Teaching

Successful Teaching: Characteristics of Successful Teaching Include:

F. Knowledge Grasp of the subject material.

G. Preparation and Organization Constructing detailed course outlines and syllabi, establishing course objectives, and defining evaluation procedures. Also day to day lessons are carefully prepared and organized with a definite plan for each lesson.

H. Enthusiasm, Stimulation, and Clarity An infectiousness of attitudes toward the subject matter. The ability to stimulate interest and thinking about the subject matter. The teacher's skill of presentation, the ability to explain concepts, summarize major premises and present material in a systematic manner.

I. Availability, Patience, and Tolerance Willingness to spend time with students inside and outside the classroom to explain concepts and listen to their views.

J. Student Empowerment A commitment in one's teaching to empower students to become responsible for their own learning.

(The criteria above based on: Sherman, Thomas, et al (1987) "The Quest for Excellence in University Teaching," Journal of Higher Education 48 (January/February): 66-84.)

II. The Teaching Portfolio: It is recommended, but not required, that members of the Department of Political Science maintain a teaching portfolio that may be kept on file by the chairperson. The following may be contained in the portfolio (taken from Peter Seldin (1991) *The Teaching Portfolio* Bolton, MA: Anke Publishing Company).

A. Material from the faculty member that may be included in the teaching portfolio:

4. Statement of teaching responsibilities and a description of how each course is taught.
5. Representative course syllabi.
6. Description of steps taken to improve one's teaching, including time spent reading journals as well as participation in workshops, seminars, and professional meetings devoted to teaching.
7. Descriptions of course revisions undertaken over time.
8. Publications or professional papers written and presented.
9. Information about honors theses directed and independent studies directed.

B. Material from others that may be included in the teaching portfolio:

7. Written evaluations by the chairperson and or colleagues who have observed the faculty member in the classroom.
8. Statements from colleagues who have systematically reviewed the faculty member's classroom materials, course syllabi, evaluation procedures, text selection and reading lists.
9. Student course and teaching evaluation data.
10. Honors or recognition by colleagues such as teaching award.
11. Videotape of the faculty member teaching.
12. Letters from students concerning teaching.

C. Products of Good Teaching

2. Student publications or conference presentations that result from course related work.

Criteria Used To Evaluate Service

As with the list of professional contributions above, the following rank ordered lists of service contributions are meant to be illustrative, but not exhaustive, of types of service contributions. Also, the rankings are illustrative of generally accepted levels of contribution, but they may vary in individual cases based on the quality or significance of particular contributions:

I. Department Service

Service as Department chair
Department assignments and chair of department committees
Department committee activity
Attendance at functions (lectures, seminars, receptions) sponsored by the Department

V. College Service

Faculty Senate officer
Academic program director or College administrative appointment
Chair of College and/or Faculty Senate committees
Faculty Senate membership
Service on College committees
Attendance at College sponsored academic events

VI. Service to the Profession

Officer in a national or regional academic organization
Discussant or chair on a panel at a professional meeting
Review of a prospectus or grant proposal
Referee for a professional journal

VII. Service to the Community

Local speeches, newspaper op-ed pieces, televised interviews
Use of professional expertise for the benefit of the community or of a community organization