PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS

Performance evaluations of faculty of the Department for purposes of annual evaluation, promotion, tenure and continuing contract recommendations shall be in accord with criteria described below and consistent with the applicable Agreement between the University of Maine System and Associated Faculties of the University of Maine System. The peer committee for all such recommendations shall be the Personnel Subcommittee of the Department of Political Science.

1. In its consideration of a faculty member for annual review, tenure, continuing contract or promotion, the peer committee shall:

   a. have access to the faculty member's personnel file, including any supplementary materials provided by the faculty member, and
   b. provide the faculty member with an opportunity to meet with and address the committee.

The peer committee may request from the faculty member supporting documents or other information pertaining to assignments of the faculty member.

2. Evaluation Criteria: Recognizing that the mission of the University is teaching, research and public service, the Department shall evaluate faculty using the following criteria, which are listed in alphabetical order:

   a. Course and curricular development, whether disciplinary or interdisciplinary;
   b. Departmental, college, campus and University assignments and service;
   c. Instruction, including service learning and internships, disciplinary and interdisciplinary;
   d. Professional activities, including disciplinary and interdisciplinary professional association and consulting, whether compensated or uncompensated;
   d. Public service in discipline, whether compensated or uncompensated;
   e. Publications and papers in disciplinary and interdisciplinary venues, domestic and foreign;
   g. Research, including applied research, whether funded or unfunded;
   h. Scholarly writing, whether published or unpublished;
   i. Service to the wider community;
   j. Student advising.

These evaluation criteria shall be the sole criteria relating to professional
performance used in personnel recommendations except as otherwise provided in the applicable Agreement between the University of Maine System and Associated Faculties of the University of Maine System. Evaluation criteria shall remain in force until such time as revisions have been developed and approved.

3. Evaluation of teaching shall be the most important factor considered. Effective teaching is necessary for promotion and tenure. The peer committee shall review teaching materials such as syllabi, assignments, tests, summaries of student evaluations, and such other materials as they deem appropriate. The peer committee shall note new course development and the number of students taught during the period evaluated. Student course evaluations shall be considered during performance evaluation. Summaries of student evaluations shall be prepared by departmental administrative staff who are not students, and shall be verified by the chair. For tenure, promotion, reappointment and post-tenure review, the candidate may request a departmental peer observer and prepare a brief written report on classroom instruction; the candidate may provide a teaching portfolio in supplemental materials.

4. Scholarship comprises original research and scholarly publication. Faculty shall be evaluated on their distinctive disciplinary and interdisciplinary contributions through scholarly publications, research, and/or creative work. Contributions are distinctive when they are original, when they address a general and public body of knowledge or creative work, and when they are presented to professional communities including those beyond the local (i.e. regional, national, or international).

The Department values authorship or co-authorship of published scholarly books or textbooks, peer-reviewed journal articles, and chapters in scholarly books above authorship or co-authorship of derivative textbooks, editorship of scholarly books or textbooks, authorship of research monographs, professional reports, bibliographies, book reviews, academic conference papers, teaching materials, or other scholarly works, all of which are valued as research and scholarship.

Because there are many different types of scholarship accepted within the discipline of Political Science, and because they may be presented in many different combinations to a peer committee by different candidates, the Department deems it unwise to attempt to specify in advance how many of what type of scholarship would demonstrate an adequate level of performance for all candidates. Evaluations of performance shall be made on a case-by-case basis, considering the previous record of the person evaluated, and previous advice given concerning plans for future activity. An assessment of previous performance in terms of expectations for promotion and/or tenure shall be communicated to the person evaluated during each performance review and to the dean in the form of the required letter of recommendation from the peer committee.
5. Service to the department, college, and university; service to a faculty member's discipline or professional association; and service in a professional capacity to the wider community are expected of faculty members of all ranks. Pre-tenure faculty members should normally carry lighter service. Service comprises committee work or special assignments, the holding of leadership positions, presentation of papers and speeches to outside groups, consulting, interviews with the news media, articles in encyclopedias, professional newsletters, trade magazines, opinion-editorial pieces, and other work in the individual’s field, and work in community projects in a professional capacity.

6. During performance evaluations of faculty, the peer committee may conclude performance in the period under review is satisfactory, outstanding, or unsatisfactory in each area for which evaluation criteria are identified, and in overall evaluation.

   a. Satisfactory performance means a record of course and curricular development, advising and instruction with acceptable teaching evaluations by students or peers; evidence of research and scholarly activity, some of which should be published; and active service within the university, professional associations, and the wider community.

   b. Outstanding performance means a more than satisfactory record of course and curricular development, advising and instruction with superior teaching evaluations by students or peers; evidence of research and scholarly achievement published in a book, or peer-reviewed journal; and service leadership in the form of office holding, substantial contributions or special assignments in committees within the university, professional associations, or community organizations.

7. Expectations for ranks. A Ph.D. or appropriate terminal degree is prerequisite for all except a fixed-length, temporary, emergency or part-time appointment. Candidates for tenure-track positions shall have demonstrated promise in teaching and scholarship.

For reappointment beyond the second year, evidence of scholarship, published or unpublished, complete or in progress, must be presented to the peer committee. By the end of the second year the candidate shall have demonstrated satisfactory performance in teaching and service.

For reappointment beyond the fourth year, the peer committee must be able to discern a pattern of significant and continuing intellectual development as evidenced by scholarship published or accepted in appropriate venues. The overall record must also demonstrate that the candidate has a record of satisfactory teaching and active service.

A recommendation for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor requires a
sustained record of scholarship and a discernible pattern of intellectual
development. Ordinarily, such evidence will consist of scholarship, at least some
of which was published or presented in peer-reviewed venues. A favorable
recommendation also requires a sustained record of high quality teaching and an
active record of satisfactory service.

Promotion to the rank of Professor requires a significant disciplinary or
interdisciplinary contribution to scholarship and a reputation beyond the local or
regional. Such standing requires a substantial body of published scholarship, as
recognized by peers. Also required is a sustained pattern of excellence in
teaching and an active record of satisfactory service.

8. Performance evaluations shall be scheduled to insure that applicable
promotion, tenure, continuing contract status, and reappointment schedules
and/or deadlines are met.

In arriving at a recommendation for promotion and/or tenure, the peer committee
shall consider, among other matters, letters evaluating the work of the applicant.
The letters must come from sources both within and outside of the University of
Maine System. The chair of the peer committee shall solicit all letters, both
internal and external, on behalf of the candidate. The candidate will present the
names of five or more persons external to the University of Maine System who
are able to comment on the candidate’s scholarship. The committee may add
names to the list. The committee will select and request comments from at least
four of those on the final list. Three letters shall become part of the applicant’s
file. The candidate will select the other referees. The peer committee shall
forward its performance evaluation and recommendation regarding annual
review, tenure, continuing contract or promotion to the department chair in a
timely manner. Peer recommendations, both majority and minority (if any), must
be signed by all of the peer committee members participating in the
recommendation. The names of all peer committee members must be listed and
a tally of the vote, including any abstentions, must be recorded.

9. Within one week of receipt of the peer recommendation from the chair of the
personnel subcommittee, the faculty member may prepare a written response to
the recommendation. The response, if any, shall go forward with the
recommendation.

Approved by Dean Luisa Deprez November 12, 2004