

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE
WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY
FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Approved by the Department of Political Science, 25 May 2012

Approved by the Office of the Provost, 9 July 2012

The Department of Political Science Faculty Development and Evaluation Manual supplements and complements the *West Virginia University Policies and Procedures for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure* and the *Eberly College of Arts and Sciences Guidelines for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Performance-Based Pay, Promotion and Tenure*. Since the basic and fundamental review of faculty takes place within the department, the purpose of this manual is to describe and elaborate upon the criteria and policies for faculty assignments, faculty files, faculty evaluation, performance-based salary increases, promotion, and tenure at the departmental level. Department policies are intended to conform to those of the West Virginia University Board of Governors, those of West Virginia University and those of the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences. Therefore, it is important for faculty to study carefully the criteria, requirements, and procedures outlined in this manual and in the Board, University and College documents). In event of conflict among documents, their precedence is Board, University, College, and Department.

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 performance-based salary increases and for promotion and tenure recommendations.

The faculty evaluation process in the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences and the Department of Political Science includes several components, among them the letter of appointment, annual assignment, the Permanent Faculty Evaluation File, and annual performance reviews and feedback documents. Tenure-track and promotion-eligible faculty positions include provision for promotion review. Tenure-track faculty members are subject to a fourth-year review to determine the extent to which the individual is making clear progress toward tenure. Failure to demonstrate clear progress in the areas of expected significant contribution, normally teaching, research, and service; failure to achieve an independent research program; and/or failure to fulfill the expectations in one's letter of appointment by the time of the fourth-year review may lead to the issuance of a terminal contract before the critical year.

In this document Chair refers to the Chair of the Department of Political Science. Department refers to the Department of Political Science. College refers to the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences. Dean refers to the Dean of the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences. University refers to West Virginia University. Provost refers to the Provost of West Virginia University.

THE APPOINTMENT LETTER

The appointment letter defines broad expectations of the position, including percentages of the assignment allocated to teaching, research, and service, and other activities. Additional contractual agreements and memorandums of understanding may include specific statements of expectations for faculty members.

ANNUAL FACULTY WORKLOAD ASSIGNMENT

Annual faculty workload assignments recognize that different faculty members contribute in different ways. Annual assignment plans reflect collaborative discussion between faculty members and the Chair. They provide opportunity to review progress, set goals, guide faculty toward success, and clarify metrics of evaluation. All research, teaching, and other faculty members participate in formalized annual assignment planning and feedback.

The percentages of the appointment allocated to teaching, research, and service that are applied in annual faculty evaluations and calculation of performance-based salary increases remain as they are described in the appointment letter unless adjusted by a memorandum of understanding approved by the Dean. Annual appointments in the College are normally:

	Teaching	Research	Service
Tenure-track or Tenured Research Active Faculty	30-40%	40-50%	20%
Teaching Faculty	80%	0%	20%
Senior Lecturer	100%		
Lecturer	100%		
Clinical Faculty	Maximum of 14 credit hours	5-10% max	50+%
Research Faculty		100%	

Research Active Faculty Members are tenure-track or tenured faculty who are also Regular Members of the Graduate Faculty of the College¹ and who do not hold letters of appointment as teaching faculty. The normal annual teaching assignment for Research Active faculty members with 40% teaching appointments in the Department is the equivalent of two courses per semester

¹ Regular Membership in the Graduate Faculty of the College requires a tenure-track appointment, the Ph.D., and "a record of scholarly research and writing equivalent to the publication of at least one peer-reviewed article in a journal of the faculty member's area of scholarly activity within the past three years" (Eberly College of Arts and Sciences, *Criteria for Appointment and Continuation of Graduate Faculty*).

and membership on graduate student committees. These assignments may be adjusted by a letter of appointment, contractual agreement, or memorandum of understanding approved by the Dean.

Teaching Faculty Members are non-tenure eligible faculty members who hold letters of appointment as teaching faculty. Teaching faculty members will normally teach the equivalent of four courses per semester. According to University policy, Teaching Faculty members are also expected to undertake “a continuing program of studies, investigations, or creative works.” For teaching faculty, this will be defined as expectation that the Annual Faculty Evaluation File includes systematic assessment of instructional processes/outcomes and application of findings to enhancing course and program effectiveness.

If a tenure track or tenured faculty member is no longer research active s/he will normally have their annual teaching assignments adjusted by the Chair to require the teaching of more courses per semester. Such adjustment in the annual teaching assignment does not automatically change the tenure-track/tenured faculty member’s percentage calculations for performance-based pay or expectations for tenure or promotion.

Lecturer and *Senior Lecturer* appointments are normally a maximum of 0.80 full time equivalent of a faculty position, 100% of which is allocated to teaching.

Expectations for *Clinical* and *Research Faculty* are defined in the appointment letter and/or subsequent Memoranda of Understanding

Evaluation of Faculty Granted Leave from Normal Workload

For faculty members approved for sabbatical or professional development program leave, the approved application and leave plan is considered a memorandum of understanding temporarily adjusting the faculty member’s assignment for the leave period.

Faculty on a full year’s *sabbatical leave* would normally be evaluated as a temporary 100% research appointment for leave extending across the evaluation period. For a single semester’s sabbatical leave, evaluation would typically be 60%-70% research, 20-30% teaching and 10% service.

Faculty on a full year’s *professional development leave related to teaching* would normally be evaluated as a temporary 100% teaching appointment for leave extending across the evaluation period. For a single semester’s leave, a tenure-track faculty member’s annual evaluation would typically be 60%-70% teaching, 20-30% research and 10% service. Teaching faculty would typically be 90% teaching and 10% service.

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.

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROCESS

The annual review serves as a tool for faculty development at all ranks, regardless of tenure status. All faculty members shall receive separate annual evaluations from the Chair and the

Faculty Evaluation Committee. The Chair and Committee's conclusions must be substantiated by direct reference to material in the Annual Faculty Evaluation File.

The Chair and Faculty Evaluation Committee each also serve as independent evaluating bodies for recommendations of tenure, promotion, and termination. Each has the responsibility to ensure that the review process is fair and that the final recommendation is based on sound documentation. The Chair and Committee's conclusions must be substantiated by direct reference to material in the Permanent Faculty Evaluation File.

FACULTY EVALUATION COMMITTEE

The Department's Faculty Evaluation Committee will normally include a minimum of five members. A person who is under consideration for promotion and/or tenure should not serve on the committee reviewing her/his Permanent or Annual Faculty Evaluation File. The committee composition should be inclusive of tenured, tenure-track faculty, and non-tenure-track faculty who qualify for performance-based salary increases.

All members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee must sign the committee statement to verify the vote and recommendation, even in the rare case in which a member abstains from voting.

The Department Faculty Evaluation Committee is composed of five faculty members. No fewer than three faculty members shall be elected by the faculty from those holding the rank of Professor. No more than two faculty members shall be elected by the faculty at the rank of Associate Professor. Except in a year where a member of the Department is up for promotion and tenure, one Assistant Professor shall serve one year only on the committee, by rotation, in the second, third, or fourth year of probationary service. In those years where the committee is considering a faculty member for promotion and/or tenure, the position of assistant professor on the committee will instead be filled by a faculty member elected from the rank of professor or associate professor. Faculty members applying for promotion and/or tenure are not eligible for service on the committee. No faculty member may serve more than three consecutive terms on the committee. Should two or more faculty members have served on the committee for at least the previous three years, only the one who has served on the committee for the most consecutive years will be ineligible to serve in the coming year. In the event that a tie still exists, that tie will be broken so that only the faculty member who has been at the University the longest (among those tied for longest consecutive service on the Committee) will be ineligible to serve in the coming year. A majority of the committee must be tenured faculty.

Each year's Faculty Evaluation Committee will be selected no later than September 1 of the current academic year. For the selection of non-rotated faculty members, the Chair will cause secret paper ballots to be prepared including all eligible faculty grouped by rank. Following a reasonable time interval to be determined by the Chair, tenured and tenure-track faculty will return their marked ballots to the Chair in sealed envelopes.

The chair of the Faculty Evaluation Committee is selected by the committee. The chair will normally be a tenured faculty member and will normally have at least one year of recent prior experience on Faculty Evaluation Committee. The Chair will serve as the judge of each election, and will be responsible for opening and counting the ballots with the assistance of a Department

Administrative Associate. A plurality of ballots within each rank will be deemed sufficient to elect. In case of ties, selection will be made by a run-off election between tied candidates within a particular rank. Ballots will be preserved for faculty inspection in the Department office.

Elected and rotated members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee will serve for one full academic year. The Chair may call special elections at any time to fill vacancies caused by resignation or disability.

Members recuse themselves when the committee is evaluating their partner, spouse, or other immediate family member in the annual evaluation process. When this proviso applies for the chair of the committee, another member of the committee serves as acting chair for that single deliberation.

Faculty members who serve on the College Faculty Evaluation Committee may not serve on the Department's Faculty Evaluation Committee.

It is understood that members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee keep committee deliberations and all information contained in any evaluation files strictly confidential.

THE PERMANENT FACULTY EVALUATION FILE

The Permanent Faculty Evaluation File is the composite record of the activities of a faculty member. It is the only record of faculty productivity at the University, and its integrity must be scrupulously maintained. Once an item is entered into the Permanent Faculty Evaluation File, it may not be removed; all inventories must also be retained. Generally speaking, Permanent Faculty Evaluation Files may not leave the administrative office suite where they are housed

Faculty must annually update their Permanent Faculty Evaluation File with the documentation of activities completed and placed in the Annual Faculty Evaluation File. On a department-specified deadline date, the Permanent Faculty Evaluation shall be closed for the review period. Only materials generated by the Chair and Faculty Evaluation Committee shall be added to the Permanent Faculty Evaluation after the deadline date.

Each Permanent Faculty Evaluation File must have an inventory or directory of its contents to ensure the integrity of the file. All faculty Permanent Faculty Evaluations File inventories in the College will be organized following a sample format that maintains four separate inventories for (1) the administrative file, and for (2) teaching, (3) research, and (4) service documentation. Permanent Faculty Evaluation materials should be organized in folders and not bound.

The *administrative file* includes: (a) the letter of appointment; (b) annual assignments and other documents that may describe or modify a faculty member's assignment (e.g. memoranda of understanding, subsequent letters of agreement, annual faculty workload report); (c) annual Chair and Faculty Evaluation Committee evaluations and any written responses; (d) annual CVs and productivity reports; and (e) other information and records that the Chair or Dean may wish to include.

The *teaching, research, and service files* include documentation for each respective area of responsibility. The faculty member must identify to which file each piece of documentation is

submitted. The inclusion of a narrative that places materials in context is highly recommended. Each document should be tagged with an inventory number.

THE ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION FILE

The Annual Faculty Evaluation File will serve as the body of evidence used for the yearly assessment of all faculty members by the Chair and Faculty Evaluation Committee.

The Annual Faculty Evaluation File should include only evidence of activities as a faculty member of the Department for the calendar year of the evaluation. It must be filed with the Department office on or before the last business day of the calendar year, and it will be added to the Permanent Faculty Evaluation File. A table of contents should be provided for the annual file. In completing their annual faculty evaluation/activities reports, faculty members should group their professional activities under the relevant categories for: I Administrative Materials, II Teaching, III Research and other Scholarly Activity, and IV Service. The contents should include the following:

Table of Contents

Annual Administrative File

The annual administrative file should include the faculty member's:

- Completed and signed Department Faculty Evaluation/Activities Report.
- Current curriculum vita.
- Yearly workload form.
- Department annual evaluation from the previous calendar year.
- When appropriate, memorandums of understanding affecting assignments, research and sabbatical leave applications, plans, and follow-up reports on activities while on leave or sabbatical.

Teaching File

In the Department annual, critical-year, and discretionary requests for promotion that are not linked to tenure evaluations of faculty teaching performance will be based on documentary evidence of the following possible types of information for courses listed as Political Science or International Studies by the Registrar of the University. Courses in other departments or programs will not be evaluated unless accompanied by a memorandum of understanding issued by the Dean or Chair that states the courses are to be considered by the Department.

When applicable, information submitted must include:

- University Senate Student Evaluations of Instruction for each class taught.

- Course organization materials, including syllabi and other distributed learning materials, regular and Senate-mandated writing assignments and syllabi for writing students, lecture preparations, and examinations.
- Grade point average for each class taught.
- Listings of numbers of graduate advisees, membership on graduate examination and dissertation committees, direction of theses and dissertations, and other specialized teaching activities.
- Results of all departmental student evaluations of undergraduate academic advising conducted during the period under review.
- Specialized teaching activities, including direction of undergraduate theses and doctoral dissertations.
- Textbooks, pedagogical scholarship, conference papers, publications appearing in refereed publications and media of high quality, and other material pertaining to student learning (Note: any publications will normally be treated as teaching and not as research contributions. Exceptions to this rule must be fully justified and documented by the faculty member in the annual activities report. The Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Chair will exercise final judgment, in their respective evaluations, as to which materials are treated as teaching contributions and which may be accepted as research).
- Awards for superior teaching from Department, College, University, State, and other sources.
- External and internal grants in support of undergraduate and graduate instruction.
- Information on the development of new courses.
- Upon request by individual faculty members, unannounced peer review(s) of their classroom session(s).
- Appraisal of course content by colleagues in the field of specialty.
- Miscellaneous correspondence from current and former students regarding teaching, advising, and/or academic supervision.

Research and Other Scholarship File

For purposes of evaluations of research performance, the Faculty Evaluation Committee will rely on discipline-related evidence of the following possible types. Copies of all materials submitted for consideration as evidence of research must be included in the research file. The file can include:

- Peer reviewed scholarly books and book chapters published by university presses and academically-oriented commercial publishers.

- Peer reviewed scholarly articles appearing in Political Science and interdisciplinary journals.
- Peer reviewed research grants awarded by international or national funding agencies, including materials related to grants such as Request for Proposals (RFP), grant applications, and grant funding awards.
- Peer reviewed book contracts based on refereed proposals.
- Peer-reviewed chapters and articles accepted for publication, with letter of acceptance.
- Grants submitted to international or national funding agencies,
- Non-peer reviewed research activities and products, including:
 - Research notes and review articles.
 - Non-refereed book chapters.
 - Professional conference papers and posters (with supporting research materials or papers) presented at the state, regional, national, and international levels.
 - In-house West Virginia University publications.
 - Non-refereed research publications (e.g., government and other agency reports).
 - Non-refereed research and development grants and contracts; and submitted book proposals, research grant proposals, and article manuscripts.
- Interim products of research in progress.

Faculty also should submit evidence of the external assessment of their research to permit the evaluation of the significance or impact their research, including:

- Reviews in scholarly journals of previously published books and articles.
- Detailed listings of citations to previously published research, indicating the cited publication(s) and the specific book(s) and/or journal article(s) in which this research is cited, together with page references.

Service File

In completing their Annual Faculty Evaluation File for service, faculty members should specify the nature, frequency, and contribution of each activity and provide substantive documentary evidence wherever possible. As appropriate, this information should be grouped into the following categories and sub-categories:

Service to the Department, e.g.,

- Service on or chairing of Department committees.
- Administrative service to the Department, including Chair, Director of Undergraduate Studies, Director of Graduate Studies, Director of the International Studies Program, and Director, West Virginia Institute for Public Affairs.
- Provision of ad hoc administrative services to the Department.
- Development of special materials such as brochures, handbooks, fliers, bibliographies, computer programs, and catalogs for Department use.
- Involvement in program and curriculum development.
- Colloquia presentations and other departmentally sponsored seminars.
- Acquisition of grants in support of departmental programs.
- Formally appointed mentor to junior faculty.

Service to the College and University, e.g.,

- Service on college and university committees and councils.
- Academic advising for the college apart from departmental advising.
- Faculty advising of student professional associations, honorary societies, and other student organizations.
- Service as an external representative of the university.
- Contributions to other programs and/or courses in the university through interdisciplinary consultation and cooperation.
- Acquisition of grants in support of college and/or university programs.

Off-Campus Public Service, e.g.,

- Professional activities in public programs.
- Consultancies to private and public agencies.
- Development and direction of special educational programs for the public.
- Membership in a professional capacity on committees and commissions at the local, state, national, and international levels.
- Professional presentations before community organizations and groups.
- Invited encyclopedia, newspaper, and magazine contributions.

- Media commentaries.

Service to the Political Science or Academic Profession, e.g.,

- Committee memberships and offices in professional associations and organizations.
- Book notes and reviews in scholarly/professional journals.
- Service as manuscript referee for scholarly/professional journals.
- Editorial service, including service as editor, for scholarly/professional journals.
- Consultancies on behalf of the profession, including pre-publication reviews of book-length manuscripts for commercial and/or university presses, and external peer reviews of professional colleagues seeking new positions, promotion, and/or tenure.
- Service as panel or roundtable discussant and/or panel chair at professional conferences and other meetings in the public and private sectors.

ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION:

PERFORMANCE DESCRIPTORS AND CRITERIA

The annual evaluation of a faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service will be assessed by the Chair and Faculty Evaluation Committee as ***Excellent*** (characterizing performance of high merit), ***Good*** (characterizing performance of merit), ***Satisfactory*** (characterizing performance sufficient to justify continuation but, for areas of expected significant contribution, not sufficient to justify promotion or tenure), or ***Unsatisfactory***.

The annual evaluation normally covers performance only for the year under review. However, 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, or continuing to remain productive. Ratings affect annual salary increases as well as the Salary Enhancement for Continued Academic Achievement.

All annual evaluations should strive to provide statements that are developmental and that can be readily understood by colleagues, particularly where suggestions for improvement are appropriate.

Meritorious work should be fully documented; for example, if information is provided for one course when one's assignment is four courses, a meritorious rating for the entire assignment should be questioned. Especially it is incumbent upon faculty to provide for the Annual Faculty Evaluation evidence (1) that demonstrates that they have carried out their assignment, and (2) that informs the reviewer(s) of the quality of their work. The evaluation focuses on evidence in the Annual Faculty Evaluation. The Department's operational guidelines for documentation include all official communications pertinent to a faculty member's assignment, such as letter of

appointment, subsequent memoranda of understanding from the Chair, Dean, and/or Provost, and letter from the faculty member covering materials submitted for annual review or in support of a request for tenure and/or promotion. If such evidence has NOT been provided, the reader's response should be, "in the absence of evidence to the contrary, I [we] must conclude that the faculty member's work is *unsatisfactory*." It is the responsibility of the Chair to provide the Committee with documentation on all items placed in the faculty member's Annual Faculty Evaluation by the Chair.

To assist faculty members in assembling Annual Faculty Evaluation materials and to assist the Chair and the Faculty Evaluation Committee in making informed and consistent evaluations within the ratings categories, the College provides a framework for documenting and evaluating the wide range of work that each person contributes in the areas of teaching, research, or service. One, some, or all of the following criteria may apply:

Significance or Impact: To what degree do the faculty member's activities (in teaching, or research, or service) *benefit* or affect students, our Department, our College, our University, our profession, or other communities or individuals? And/or to what degree do the faculty member's activities (in teaching, research, or service) reflect *originality and development* within a body of work?

Engagement: To what degree do the faculty member's activities (in teaching, or research, or service) *generate, apply, and/or use knowledge* and insight consistent with current directions in our field of study? And/or to what degree does the faculty member demonstrate *thoroughness, reliability, and availability*?

Context: To what degree are the faculty member's activities (in teaching, or research, or service) *consistent with goals* important to our Department, our College, our University, or our profession? And/or to what degree do the faculty member's activities (in teaching, research, or service) rely on *knowledge of the department, college, institution, or professional organizations*? To what degree is the faculty member willing to learn about the department, college, institution, or profession or *keep current* with changes?

For the purposes of annual faculty evaluation, merit recommendation, and recommendation for tenure and/or promotion, the Chair and Faculty Evaluation Committee will apply the following criteria:

Evaluation of Teaching

The Department affirms that excellence in teaching is among its highest priorities. Although excellence in teaching demands effective communication of significant theories and information about politics and political science, engagement with students, and rigorous assessments of student performance in undergraduate and graduate classes, the Department recognizes that it also includes other efforts to assist students both within the University and in other academic contexts. Therefore, successful teaching also includes significant interaction and engagement with and support of the generation of undergraduate student theses and graduate student dissertations and other graduate student research, conscientious advising of students, the design of new courses, pedagogical publications, and efforts to educate students in other contexts.

Normally teaching will be evaluated annually according to the following criteria:

Excellent:

Excellence in teaching shall normally require Student Evaluations of Instruction above 4.0 on the questions “The instructor’s teaching effectiveness was:” and “Considering the course objects, organization, quality of materials, class presentations, tests, course policies, etc., my overall rating of the course is”; active participation in the graduate program (if a member of the graduate faculty); and satisfaction of departmental requirements on advising, syllabi, course materials, and grade point average for courses. Additional evidence such as excellent responses on other questions on the Student Evaluation of Instruction, pedagogical publications, awards and grants for teaching, development of new courses or instructional programs, and peer reviews will enhance the assessment of excellence.

Good:

Good in teaching shall normally require Student Evaluations of Instruction between 3.5 and 3.9 on the questions “The instructor’s teaching effectiveness was:” and “Considering the course objects, organization, quality of materials, class presentations, tests, course policies, etc., my overall rating of the course is”, active participation in the graduate program (if a member of the graduate faculty); and satisfaction of departmental requirements on advising, syllabi, course materials, and grade point average for courses. Additional evidence such as good responses on other questions on the Student Evaluation of Instruction, pedagogical publications, awards and grants for teaching, development of new courses or instructional programs, and peer reviews will enhance the assessment of good.

Satisfactory:

Satisfactory in teaching shall normally require Student Evaluations of Instruction above 3.0 and 3.4 on the questions “The instructor’s teaching effectiveness was:” and “Considering the course objects, organization, quality of materials, class presentations, tests, course policies, etc., my overall rating of the course is”; some participation in the graduate program (if a member of the graduate faculty); and satisfaction of departmental requirements on advising, syllabi, course materials, and grade point average for courses. Additional evidence such as satisfactory responses on other questions on the Student Evaluation of Instruction, pedagogical publications, awards and grants for teaching, development of new courses or instructional programs, and peer reviews will enhance the assessment of satisfactory.

Unsatisfactory:

Unsatisfactory in teaching will normally reflect Student Evaluations of Instruction of below 3.0 on the questions “The instructor’s teaching effectiveness was:” and “Considering the course objects, organization, quality of materials, class presentations, tests, course policies, etc., my overall rating of the course is”; no participation in the graduate program (if a member of the graduate faculty); or failure to satisfy departmental requirements on advising, syllabi, course materials, or grade point average for courses. Failure to submit evidence about teaching earns an unsatisfactory rating.

The Chair and the Faculty Evaluation Committee reserve the discretion to assess the teaching of a faculty member in light of additional assessments of its significance, impact, and engagement as defined by Eberly College criteria. Contextual considerations, such as years of experience as a faculty member and the topics and student audience of assigned courses, also can be considered in the evaluation of teaching.

Evaluation of Research and Other Scholarship

All faculty members in the Department will engage in significant on-going and intellectually coherent programs of research and publication, in proportion to the duties specified in their letters of appointment and subsequent approved modifications of these letters, and in their annual assignments made by the Chair. The underlying departmental principle is that an active, discipline-related research agenda is valuable both for its own sake in creating and synthesizing knowledge, and also for its enhancement of teaching and service. Research is considered to be a career-long process of inquiry punctuated by products leading to and including scholarly publication. In this sense, an individual product of research should always be evaluated in the context of a continuing process of research and publication in referred outlets.

Faculty collaboration on research within the Department, University, and broader academic community is encouraged. Faculty members are expected to *identify* their contributions to such research in their annual reviews. At the same time, a research file is strengthened when it includes some publications that show the competence and ability of the individual faculty member to offer contributions as a scholar.

The Department affirms that faculty research grants, research, and research publications should always be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. However, departmental policy recognizes certain broad classes of equivalence to assist in rank ordering the successive products of faculty research. Such research must be related to the discipline of Political Science and/or scholarly research about political behavior, governmental institutions, and public policies through the use of diverse methods of analysis within and across all countries and regions of the world.

Normally research shall be evaluated annually according to the following criteria:

Excellent:

- Peer refereed book(s) published by a university or scholarly commercial press. Such books may be counted as publications in two successive annual evaluations at the discretion of the Chair and/or Faculty Evaluation Committee, or
- Award, as principal investigator or major co-investigator, of a significant peer refereed grant(s) for academic research by a national or international funding organization.

Excellent or Good, Dependent on Chair and Faculty Evaluation Committee assessment of the significance, impact, and visibility of the publication per Eberly College criteria:

- Peer refereed scholarly article(s) published or accepted for publication, with supporting letter of acceptance from the editor, by a scholarly journal (faculty members must indicate whether they wish to receive credit for the article in the year of acceptance or the year of appearance in print), or
- Peer refereed book chapter(s) published in a scholarly book, or
- Editor of a peer refereed book(s) published by a university or scholarly commercial press.
- Note: Additional evidence of the significance and visibility of publications and grants, such as national awards for publications or conference papers, reviews of publications, and citations of the work, may be considered by the Chair and Faculty Evaluation Committee when assessing whether the faculty member's research qualifies as excellent or good.

Good:

- Conference paper(s) presented and discussed at a regional, national, or international meeting of scholars, or
- Poster(s) with supporting paper presented at a regional, national, or international meeting of scholars, or
- Book manuscript accepted for publication by a university or scholarly commercial press, with certification of editorial decision to publish and evidence of peer review, or
- Book chapter(s) accepted for publication by a university or scholarly commercial press, with certification of editorial decision to publish, or
- Submission of a significant grant proposal to a national or international funding source for peer review, or
- Award of a peer refereed grant(s) of lesser significance, or in a role other than as principal investigator or major co-investigator, for academic research by a national or international funding organization.

Satisfactory:

- Research in progress and interim products of research for peer review, reflected in a partial or complete manuscript together with information about progress to date, remaining work to be performed, and schedule to completion,* or
- Book chapter or article submitted to publisher for peer review,* or
- Non-refereed publications of an applied or technical nature, research notes and review articles, non-refereed books and book chapters, in-house West Virginia University publications, government and other agency reports, non-refereed research and development grants and contracts (The Chair and Faculty Evaluation

Committee should also receive descriptions of the nature and intended audiences of non-referred publications and related materials).

Unsatisfactory:

No evidence of research activity as described in the other categories.

*Since peer reviewed publication is a primary goal of scholarly research in political science, in their consideration of faculty members' annual evaluation/activities reports the Chair and Faculty Evaluation Committee will pay particular attention to items reported but not accepted for publication or funding in terms of their potential for future peer reviewed publication.

The Chair and the Faculty Evaluation Committee reserve the discretion to assess the research of a faculty member in light of additional assessments of its significance, impact, and contextual considerations as established by the Eberly College.

Evaluation of Service

Service is defined as activities that draw on a faculty member's professional expertise, which have some relation to the Department, College, University, or profession. Service should thus be documented in a variety of ways to demonstrate a faculty member's overall contribution to the service mission of the Department, College, University, or profession. In the Department of Political Science, faculty members normally will be expected to demonstrate reasonable contributions in service. Collectively, however, the department places high value on the service activities of its faculty, performed as faculty members and as political scientists, at the Department, College, University, state, national, and international levels, and in support of the political science profession.

Faculty members who hold formal administrative appointments are annually evaluated in these particular service assignments by their administrative superiors in the College and/or the central administration of the University. In addition, separate three-year administrative evaluations of the Chair, Director of Undergraduate Studies, and Director of Graduate Studies are performed by departmental faculty and by the Department's Faculty Evaluation Committee. For all faculty members who hold formal administrative appointments, the Faculty Evaluation Committee will annually evaluate only service contributions that extend *beyond* these faculty members' routine administrative responsibilities, but documents reflecting their effectiveness in their administrative positions should still be included in their Faculty Evaluation Files.

Private consulting apart from the University is normally **not** considered as part of Annual Faculty Evaluations. Faculty members are encouraged to review consulting with the Office of Sponsored Programs, and to develop a contract with the University when appropriate. Exceptions should be clearly defined in annual assignment documentation.

A meritorious (i.e., excellent or good) service contribution normally includes documentary evidence of leadership in and/or outcomes of service responsibilities in a *combination* of the categories of Department, College, University, Off-Campus Public, and Professional Activities as identified above on pages 9 and 10. Since the amount of service expected according to a faculty member's work assignment varies across the members of the faculty, and depends on both the nature of that assignment and how far advanced a faculty member is within the faculty

and the discipline, expectations in this area will vary depending on a faculty member's work assignment, whether the faculty member is filling a major Department, College, or University service position, and the individual's position.

Normally service shall be evaluated annually according to the following criteria:

Excellent:

The service is a substantial contribution by the faculty member in some combination of activities in two or more of the categories of Department, College and University, Off-Campus Public, and Professional Activity identified on pages 8-10 above.

Good:

The service is a substantial contribution by the faculty member to at least one of Department, College and University, Off-Campus Public, or Professional Activities and some contribution in one other category of activity identified on pages 9 and 10 above.

Satisfactory:

The service constitutes the minimum amount of service activities expected of a faculty member in the categories of activity identified on pages 9 and 10 above.

Unsatisfactory:

There is an absence of documented service activity.

The Chair and the Faculty Evaluation Committee reserve the discretion to assess the service of a faculty member in light of additional assessments of its significance and impact, as defined by the Eberly College, and contextual considerations such as the years of professional experience.

REBUTTAL OR APPEAL OF ANNUAL EVALUATION

According to University guidelines

[<http://www.wvu.edu/~acadaff/fac/policies/ptguidelines04.pdf> Section XIII.A.4] faculty members can write a rebuttal of their departmental evaluations from the Faculty Evaluation Committee and/or the Department Chair; the rebuttal must be forwarded to the Dean within five working days of receipt of the evaluations.

Errors of fact should normally be addressed by a conversation with the Chair. If decisions have been made that are construed as arbitrary or capricious, or in violation of a rule, then a grievance might be appropriate. In such cases, to be prudent, faculty should work informally with the Chair while simultaneously filing a grievance so that, should the informal discussions not come to resolution, the fifteen-day window for filing a grievance will be met.

Appeal of a departmental descriptor (i.e., seeking action to have a descriptor changed) could be treated as described in the previous paragraph, and, if simultaneously grieved, must follow the West Virginia Public Employees Grievance Procedure. The grievance statute, procedural rule, and grievance form may be found online at <http://pegboard.state.wv.us/> or by contacting the office of the University's Chief Grievance Administrator at 304-293-9203.

FOURTH-YEAR REVIEW

Tenure-track faculty members are subject to a more rigorous fourth-year review to determine the extent to which the individual is making clear progress toward tenure. By this time, teaching should be at a level such that if sustained, the candidate would be judged as making a significant contribution in teaching. Because significant contributions in research are expected, there will be particular focus on expectation to have developed an active and independent research program as defined in the letter of appointment. "Significant contributions" in teaching are normally those which meet or exceed those of peers recently achieving similar promotion and/or tenure who are respected for their contributions in teaching at the University. "Significant contributions" in research are normally those which meet or exceed those of peers recently achieving similar promotion and/or tenure who are respected for their contributions in research at the University and at peer research universities. Failure to demonstrate clear progress in teaching, and/or failure to achieve an independent research program, by the time of the fourth-year review may lead to the issuance of a terminal contract prior to the critical year.

The Faculty and Evaluation Committee and Chair reviews in the fourth year are conducted following normal annual review procedures. For tenure-track faculty at the fourth year point, the Dean reviews the set of annual evaluations to date. Where concern arises regarding progress toward meeting criteria for tenure, the Dean will follow up with a request that the entire Permanent Faculty Evaluation be forwarded for assessment by the college committee.

PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE REVIEW

For a tenure-track appointment, tenure must be determined by the "critical year" as identified in the letter of appointment and any subsequent memoranda of understanding. If tenure is not awarded by that time, a one-year terminal contract will be issued for the seventh year of employment.

Tenure-track faculty with qualifying experience may, in the appointment letter, be offered the option of requesting a specified number of years of credit toward tenure. Upon receipt of such request, the Dean will confirm the critical year. If tenure is not awarded by the end of the critical year, a one-year terminal contract will be issued for the following year.

If credit toward tenure is awarded, evidence of performance for the credited length of time prior to appointment at the University should be included in the Permanent Faculty Evaluation File.

Tenure-track faculty who are not offered or do not accept credit toward tenure during the first year may during the fourth year of employment (by May 15th of the fourth year) request that the critical year be moved one year earlier. Upon the Dean's approval of such request, the new critical year will be confirmed. If tenure is not awarded by the end of the new critical year, a terminal contract will be issued for the following year.

Promotion to senior ranks is not a requirement for institutional commitment and career stability in promotable non-tenure-track faculty appointments. For these appointments, the College normally follows the same promotion timeline governing tenure-track positions.

A faculty member whose application for discretionary promotion is unsuccessful must wait at least one full year after the decision is rendered before submitting another application.

Faculty members are governed by Eberly College (<http://eberly.wvu.edu/r/download/16378>) and University and Board of Governors standards for tenure and promotion (<http://slate.wvu.edu/r/download/123667>, Part 3). Department standards are:

Department Criteria for Tenure

To be recommended for tenure, a faculty member normally will be expected to demonstrate *significant contributions* in research and in teaching in the classroom and/or other settings, together with reasonable contributions in service. At a minimum, significant contributions require the satisfaction of broad expectations for the tenure set forth in the appointment letter, contractual agreements and memorandums of understanding issued by the Dean. Additionally:

Successful teaching is an expectation for all faculty members. As a criterion for the granting of tenure, significant contributions must be made in teaching. A “significant” contribution in teaching is normally those which meet or exceed those of peers recently achieving tenure and who are respected for their teaching contributions at the University. In some cases, external reviews of teaching contributions may be appropriate.

The term “significant” contribution in research means research performance that meets or exceeds that of peers recently achieving tenure and who are respected for their research contributions at WVU and at peer research universities. Peer research universities are determined by the University in consultation with the Department.

In service, a candidate for tenure normally will be expected to demonstrate reasonable contributions.

Decisions to accept recommendations for or against retention or the awarding of tenure shall rest on the current and projected program needs and circumstances of the Department and the College and on the strengths and limitations of individual faculty members as established in the annual review process.

Department Criteria for Promotion of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty

Except in unusual circumstances as defined by the Dean, the Department recommendation for the tenure of an Assistant Professor will include a recommendation of promotion to Associate Professor.

Ordinarily, the interval between the promotion to Associate Professor and promotion to Professor in the University will be at least five years. Promotions after the first promotion will be based on achievement since the previous promotion. Promotion to the rank of Professor requires a consistent record of achievement at a level that indicates significant strengths and few weaknesses.

To be recommended for any promotion, a tenured or tenure-track faculty member normally will be expected to demonstrate significant contributions in teaching and in research. The faculty member will also be expected to make reasonable service contributions. Areas of significant

contribution in which each faculty member is expected to excel will be identified in the initial letter of appointment, and may be amended through subsequent contractual agreements and memorandums of understanding issued by the Dean.

Significant contributions in teaching are an expectation for tenure-track and tenured faculty members seeking promotion.

Significant contributions in research are an expectation for tenure-track and tenured faculty members seeking promotion. For promotion to Professor, special weight is placed on research and other scholarship completed during the most recent five- or six-year period. A long-term Associate Professor will not be penalized for years of modest research productivity, as long as more recent productivity has been achieved and maintained for a reasonable period of time. It is not uncommon for an external reviewer to consider one's total career for promotion to the highest rank. However, while not discounting work done since the last promotion, also considered is whether the candidate has demonstrated a "continuous program" of significant scholarship, normally as demonstrated by their publication record.

Reasonable service contributions to the Department, College and University, general public, and political science profession are expected for promotion. However, for tenure-track and tenured faculty members who have service as an area of significant contribution, service provided for the benefit of the residents of West Virginia will receive primary emphasis in reviews for promotion, although service to the University and to the profession of political science are also worthy of consideration. Exceptions to this normal practice may occur when a faculty member provides extraordinary and extended service to the University, political science profession, or publicly on the national or international level of affairs. Such exceptions will be identified in initial letters of appointment or in subsequently approved documents.

A full-time or part-time assignment to an administrative position or to a unit other than the Department does not carry with it an automatic modification of criteria for promotion or tenure. A faculty member who accepts such an assignment, and who seeks tenure and/or promotion, should have a written memorandum of understanding and evaluation criteria concerning both status and expectations on file within the Department. Such an agreement must be approved by the Dean and by the Provost.

Department Criteria for Promotion of Promotable, Non-Tenure-Eligible Faculty

Teaching Faculty who are promotable but not tenure-eligible must demonstrate "significant programmatic contributions" to qualify for promotion. Non-Tenure-Eligible Teaching Faculty who stand for promotion should engage in their teaching and service activities with an eye towards separating the ones that are expected of every faculty member at the University versus the ones that go beyond, and have "significant programmatic contribution" to, the teaching mission of the University.

At a minimum, significant programmatic contributions require the satisfaction of broad expectations set forth in the appointment letter, and may be amended or elaborated through subsequent contractual agreements and memorandums of understanding issued by the Dean.

Evidence related to significant programmatic contributions may include, but is not limited to:

Significant contributions in teaching, including teaching General Education Courses, teaching large-enrollment courses, consistently high teaching Student Evaluations of Instruction, teaching awards, student advising, creating and implementing new courses, teaching writing courses, teaching Honors courses, teaching graduate courses, teaching courses off-campus, and organizing and leading student courses off-campus (study abroad, etc.).

Significant contributions in extra-curricular activities or service, including serving as the Faculty Advisor of student organizations, serving on Department and College committees, coordinating extra-curricular events, Peer Led Team Learning, Extra Lecture Support Instruction, alumni relations, engaging in discipline-related community service projects, and organizing new student groups (honors society, student club, etc.).

Significant contributions in program building and/or excellence, including participating in major and minor recruitment events, mentoring graduate teaching assistants, providing guest lectures, on or off campus, engaging in course improvement and assessment-based development, participating in faculty and professional development workshops, presenting teaching studies at conferences on program-related topics; publishing articles, reviews, etc., on program-related or teaching-related topics.

In each instance, as with all faculty, documentation addressing both quality and quantity is salient in evaluation for promotion.

Expectations for promotion for Clinical and Research Faculty will be as defined in their letters of appointment and any subsequent memoranda of agreement issued by the Dean

Timeline for the Consideration of Tenure and Promotion Requests

September 1 is the *last* date for a faculty member to notify his/her chair in writing if he/she wishes to be considered for discretionary promotion or to decline consideration for tenure in the critical year.

External Evaluation Procedure for Tenure and/or Promotion

Faculty members, who request consideration for tenure and/or promotion, must adhere to the guidelines for external evaluations of research set forth by the College and the University. University policy requires that, in years when a faculty member who has research or service as an area of significant contribution is being considered for tenure or for promotion, the Permanent Faculty Evaluation File must contain evaluations of the quality of the faculty member's research or service from persons external to the University. The department Faculty Evaluation Committee and the faculty member will each prepare a list of six possible external evaluators. External evaluators should be at or above the rank to which promotion is sought and are normally faculty members at peer research institutions as defined by the University. A paragraph describing each evaluator should be submitted by the faculty member and the Faculty Evaluation Committee indicating why each evaluator is qualified to serve as an evaluator. Any personal or professional relationship between the evaluator and the faculty member should be noted.

These lists of potential evaluators must be forwarded to the Chair by September 10. The Chair will then share the Faculty Evaluation Committee list with the faculty member within two working days. The faculty member has the right to review the list and to comment on persons who may not provide an objective evaluation. The faculty member's acknowledgment of such review, with appropriate comments, should be forwarded in writing to the Chair by September 15. The Chair, or Chair in consultation with the chair of the Faculty Evaluation Committee, will select the names of a sufficient number of appropriate external reviewers from each list to ensure receipt of at least four evaluations. This selection process may take into consideration any comments of the faculty member regarding potential evaluators whose names appear on the Faculty Evaluation Committee list. The faculty member is not informed of the names in the final list of external evaluators. The final list, and the evaluation solicitation letter, should be forwarded to the Dean for approval by September 20.

PERFORMANCE-BASED SALARY POLICY

Annual evaluations will be used to determine performance-based salary recommendations. The performance-based salary policy is intended to reward performance of merit.

The College values translate rating descriptors to a salary policy "Merit Score" as follows: "Excellent" = 4.0; "Good" = 2.5; "Satisfactory" = 1.0, "Unsatisfactory" = 0.0. If the Chair and the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) present different ratings descriptors the merit score is an average of the two evaluations.

A total Merit Score is calculated by multiplying appointment distribution times the rating; e.g.:

Example 1:

$$40\% \text{ teaching} = 40 \times 2.5 \text{ (rating of "Good")} = 100$$

$$40\% \text{ research} = 40 \times 4.0 \text{ (rating of "Excellent")} = 160$$

$$\underline{20\% \text{ service} = 20 \times 1.0 \text{ (rating of "Satisfactory")} = 20}$$

$$\text{Merit Score} = 280$$

Example 2:

$$40\% \text{ teaching} = 40 \times 3.25 \text{ (rating of "Excellent" by Chair, "Good" by FEC)} = 130$$

$$40\% \text{ research} = 40 \times 4.0 \text{ (rating of "Excellent")} = 160$$

$$\underline{20\% \text{ service} = 20 \times 1.75 \text{ (rating of "Satisfactory" by Chair, "Good" by FEC)} = 35}$$

$$\text{Merit Score} = 325$$

Example 3:

$$80\% \text{ teaching} = 80 \times 2.5 \text{ (rating of "Good")} = 200$$

$$\underline{20\% \text{ service} = 20 \times 2.5 \text{ (rating of "Good")} = 50}$$

Merit Score = 250

DEPARTMENT SABBATICAL LEAVE POLICY

Sabbatical leave applicants must follow all regulations concerning sabbaticals issued by the University. In addition to the completion of the relevant University application forms, the political science faculty member must provide the Faculty Evaluation Committee and Chair a three to five page research design that covers the following:

- specific objectives of the requested sabbatical leave
- plan for achieving stated objectives
- Applicant's qualifications for the proposed work
- documentation, where applicable, of an invitation to a research institute, laboratory, or other appropriate institution or setting
- ways in which the proposed work will further the goals of the Department, College, and University

Applicants for sabbatical leave must submit their proposed research designs for approval by the Chair and the Faculty Evaluation Committee. The Committee will confine its review and recommendation to the merits of the proposal. The Chair will determine the administrative implications and appropriateness of the sabbatical leave request. Each faculty member's proposed research design must follow one of two models:

Model 1

Submission of a research design that includes:

- Statement of a research problem.
- Hypothesis or hypotheses to be tested.
- Bibliography of related research.
- Data requirements.
- Data sources, including letters affirming organizational cooperation if necessary to collect data.
- Significance of the research.
- Qualifications of the investigator.

Model 2

Submission of a research design that includes:

- Detailed description of the topic/subject to be investigated and the methodology to be employed.
- Sources of information, including letters affirming organizational cooperation if necessary to gather information.
- Bibliography of related research.

- Significance of research.
- Qualifications of the investigator

January 1 is the deadline for faculty sabbatical leave applications to be forwarded to the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Chair. January 15 is the deadline for departmental sabbatical leave recommendations to be forwarded to the Dean.

AWARD OF EMERITUS STATUS

Faculty members whose retirement is announced and who have met the requirements of meritorious contributions to the Department shall be recommended for Emeritus status. To be recommended for this honor, a faculty member must have achieved a distinguished record of teaching, research, and/or service as a professional political scientist and/or as an academic administrator. To be considered for Emeritus status, a faculty member must also normally hold the rank of professor or associate professor and must normally have served at the University for at least 10 years.

If they meet these requirements, faculty members/administrators whose retirement is announced will be automatically considered for Emeritus status recommendation. In the Department the criteria and processes for Emeritus status recommendations shall be the same as those used for promotion in rank, with the exception of the requirement for external reviews of research. The review of candidates thus begins with the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Chair. Final decision on awarding Emeritus status rests with the President of the University. Faculty members/administrators who announce their retirement after the Committee's and Chair's annual review of faculty may be considered for Emeritus recommendation during the next departmental review cycle.

PROCEDURE FOR MODIFICATION OF THIS DOCUMENT

A member of the faculty can propose a change or an addition to this document by making a recommendation to the Faculty Evaluation Committee and to the Chair of the Department. The Committee and the Chair will then discuss the proposal and make a recommendation to the Faculty. If the Faculty approves the proposal by a majority vote, the change or addition will be forwarded for approval by the Dean and the Provost. Upon such approval, the change will be adopted.

<end of document>

FOR REFERENCE

APPENDIX I

EXPECTATIONS FOR FACULTY MEMBERS AT West Virginia UNIVERSITY

A. Faculty members at West Virginia University who are assigned to teach must be able to:

1. Communicate effectively with students;
2. Provide feedback to students, including but not limited to the timely return of assignments, papers, and examinations;
3. Maintain an instructional environment that is conducive to student learning, based upon open communication and mutual respect;
4. Disseminate knowledge and information at a level appropriate to the level at which the subject is taught;
5. Stimulate critical thinking;
6. Demonstrate intellectual competence, integrity, independence, a spirit of scholarly inquiry, a dedication to improving methods of presenting material, respect for differences and diversity, and the ability to stimulate and cultivate the intellectual interest and enthusiasm of students.

B1. Faculty members at West Virginia University who are assigned to conduct research must be able to:

1. Disseminate their research findings in appropriate venues;
2. Prepare grant proposals that can be understood by the potential reader;
3. Upon receipt of a grant, manage/implement its terms appropriately;
4. Undertake a continuing program of studies or investigations;
5. Advance collaborative interdisciplinary research when possible;
6. Provide opportunities for students to collaborate in research activities;
7. Engage in research that will inform their teaching when teaching is assigned.

B2. Faculty members at West Virginia University who are assigned to engage in scholarly activity must be able to:

1. Disseminate their scholarly findings in appropriate venues;
2. Prepare grant proposals (if appropriate) that can be understood by the potential reader;

3. Upon receipt of a grant, manage/implement its terms appropriately;
4. Undertake a continuing program of studies or investigations;
5. Advance collaborative interdisciplinary research when possible;
6. Provide opportunities for students to collaborate in scholarly activities;
7. Engage in scholarly activity that will inform their teaching when teaching is assigned.

B3. Faculty members at West Virginia University who are assigned to engage in creative activity must be able to:

1. Disseminate the results of creative activity in appropriate venues;
2. Prepare grant proposals (if appropriate) that can be understood by the potential reader;
3. Upon receipt of a grant, manage/implement its terms appropriately;
4. Undertake a continuing program of creative activity;
5. Advance collaborative interdisciplinary projects when possible;
6. Provide opportunities for students to collaborate in creative activities;
7. Engage in creative activity that will inform their teaching when teaching is assigned.

C1. Faculty members at West Virginia University who are assigned to engage in service to the institution must be able to:

1. Contribute to the efficiency and effectiveness of the faculty member's department and college;
2. Take part in the department, college, and institutional shared governance process;
3. Assume an obligation to the unit's future;
4. Accept the expectation to help solve problems and respond to special needs in order to help with the future of the degree granting program.

C2. Faculty members at West Virginia University who are assigned to engage in service to the profession must be able to:

1. Seek opportunities to serve appropriate professional organizations at a variety of levels, including but not limited to state, regional, national, and international organizations;
2. Represent the interests of West Virginia University in ways that reflect positively upon the institution.

C3. Faculty members at West Virginia University who are assigned to engage in service to the external community must be able to:

1. Make contributions that are within a person's professional expertise as a faculty member, and performed with one's university affiliation identified;

2. Seek opportunities that apply the benefits and products of teaching and research to address the needs of society.

D. Faculty members at West Virginia University should strive to integrate all aspects of their assignment so that each dimension of the mission affects and informs the other dimensions.

These expectations can be adjusted to accord with Americans with Disabilities Act and other state and federal regulations.

FOR REFERENCE

APPENDIX II

SAMPLE CHRONOLOGICAL INVENTORY OF ANNUAL REVIEW FILE ENTRIES

Susan A. Smart

Faculty Member

Administrative and Other Entries

(The letter "A" precedes the number of administrative and other entries.)

Inventory Date Number Entered Item Description Item Date

A-01 4/15/08 Offer letter from Dean Sotopé 4/12/08

A-02 10/14/08 Curriculum vitae 10/1/08

A-03 12/29/08 Faculty Productivity Report Fall, 2008

A-04 1/8/09 Annual review letter from 1/8/09 Faculty Evaluation Committee

A-05 1/11/09 Annual review letter from Chair 1/10/09

A-06 5/18/09 Summary sheet from 5/15/09 application for Faculty Development Grant funding to attend ASEA meeting

A-07 10/20/09 Faculty Productivity Report 10/20/09

A-08 11/6/09 Annual review letter from 11/3/09 Faculty Evaluation Committee

A-09 11/6/09 Annual review letter from Chair 11/5/09

Teaching Entries

(The letter "T" precedes the number assigned to teaching entries.)

Inventory Date Number Entered Item Description Item Date

T-01 8/24/08 Syllabus for SE 240 Fall, 2008

T-02 8/24/08 Syllabus for SE 340 Fall, 2008

T-03 10/14/08 Report of Professor Trumble of 10/12/08 classroom observation

T-04 12/3/08 Report of Professor Trumble of 12/1/08 classroom observation

T-05 12/15/08 24 Student evaluations of SE 240, Section 1 Fall, 2008 using departmental form

T-06 12/15/08 26 student evaluations of SE 240, Section 2 Fall, 2008 using departmental form

T-07 12/15/08 10 student evaluations of SE 340 Fall, 2008 using departmental form

T-08 1/11/09 Syllabus for SE 62 Spring, 2009

T-09 1/11/09 Syllabus for SE 340 Spring, 2009

T-10 2/20/09 24 Senate evaluation forms for SE 240, 2/11/09 Section 1 taught Fall, 2008

T-11 2/20/09 27 Senate evaluations forms for SE 240, 2/11/09 Section 2 taught Fall, 2008

T-12 2/20/09 10 Senate evaluation forms for SE 340 2/11/09 taught Fall, 2008

T-13 3/10/09 Report of chairperson's observations of 3/7/09 classroom instruction

T-14 3/15/09 Memo from S. Smart to Chair McKee 3/14/09 clarifying some issues raised in report of teaching observations

T-15 6/22/09 30 Senate evaluations for SE 62, 6/18/09 Summary sheet and summarized student comments

Research Entries

(The letter "R" precedes the number of research entries.)

Number Entered Item Description Item Date

R-01 11/5/08 Application for Senate 11/1/08 Research Grant

R-02 3/6/09 Notification of award of 3/1/09 Senate Research Grant

R-03 3/20/09 Letter indicating acceptance 3/14/09 of article in The Social Ecology

Reporter and copy of article

R-04 3/22/09 Memo of congratulations from 3/22/09 Chair on article acceptance

R-05 4/2/09 Copy of article submitted to 3/29/09 The Professional Ecologist for possible publication with cover letter

R-06 7/30/09 Letter from Dr. P.C. Bees to 7/10/09 Editor of The Social Ecology Reporter commenting on Smart's article

R-07 9/3/09 Report on research conducted 8/30/09 in summer on Senate Research Grant

Service Entries

(The letter "S" precedes the number of service entries.)

Inventory Date Number Entered Item Description Item Date

S-01 9/15/08 Memo from Chair appointing to 9/10/08 Departmental Curriculum Committee