Department of Political Science
Annual Evaluation Requirements and Instructions

We'll soon begin the process of evaluating faculty as part of the annual evaluation for the year just concluded. You can submit the attached departmental form or you can use the annual report generated from the PRO system. The instructions are below. **The deadline is February 18, 2023 by 5 p.m**. The Advisory Committee will review your file during the spring semester and will make collective assessments of your performance. Please refer to the departmental bylaws for the specifics of this process.

University and Departmental policy requires all faculty members to submit an annual report for use by the Advisory Committee for the annual evaluation process. These evaluations are also used in making merit recommendations to the Dean if merit raises are available. The report includes the attached form and any supplemental materials you wish to submit. **You are reminded that the penalty for not submitting this report is an automatic rating of poor**.

General
   (1) You must submit a completed Faculty Annual Report Form; you can use the traditional form or generate the form out of the PRO system (which has been adapted to include nearly all of the material on the traditional form) into a word processing document. If you generate the form from PRO you would have to add any narrative you would like to include and you may want to add additional detail about student advising and committees.
   (2) Also **submit a PDF version** of up-to-date electronic **copy of your vita** (which you can generate in PRO).
   (3) You will need to **update your electronic account on PRO** either way
   (4) If for whatever reason you cannot submit electronic copies of materials please let the chair know and provide the materials to the chair; if you need assistance with the PRO system please inform the chair.
   (5) **The university is phasing out PRO for Faculty Insight and this is accessed through Academic Analytics** see https://aire.ku.edu/academic-analytics

   Academic Analytics Instruction: Once you are on the page, look to the right and scroll down a little. Under the heading "Log-in Links" you will see "Faculty Insight". Click that and log in then you should get into the system. Faculty Insight (FI) will generate a CV in PDF form, and you can add or edit this through "My Profile".

PRO Instructions
Log onto PRO
Got to Reports (top)
Select: CLAS Annual Report Soc & Beh Sci
Select 2022 date range
Select citation style, format, etc.

Run report (button top right)

Submit your materials on OneDrive, folder "Faculty Annual Review for Spring 22 and Fall 22" (if a folder with your name has not been created please add one). This is where you should upload your files. Here is the shared link for OneDrive: https://kansas-my.sharepoint.com/:f:/g/personal/kennedy1_home_ku_edu/EsdPRcWQTUlMkm7zbcZGZe0BpAZQqv_SZx4bjiW8z3BUsA Let me know if you have any problems; **otherwise you can email your files to the chair directly**.

Teaching

      We employ portfolio evaluation on teaching, so you are welcome to submit syllabi, examinations, and other relevant course materials for the spring and fall semesters (and summer if relevant) of the past calendar year. You are reminded that we employ the following guideline. "In general, there has been too much emphasis on 'overall teaching effectiveness' scores from student feedback. Developing new courses, teaching larger numbers of students, mentoring and advising students – in short, the overall teaching contribution – should be our primary concern." The quantitative scores of teaching effectiveness will be available to the Advisory Committee electronically and you do not need to submit these scores.

Research

      To facilitate assessment of your research you can submit abstracts, letters of acceptance along with a full set of referee comments, and published reviews of your publications. It is helpful if you include in your dossier the complete manuscripts of work completed, accepted, or published this past calendar year.

      You can add a section on "Intellectual Development" at the end of the research section of the annual report. Here you may describe major undertakings to acquire new skills (e.g., computer technologies, research methods, foreign language, or interdisciplinary understandings) or begin a new research endeavor that has yet to bear papers or publications (e.g., field work).

Service

      Please submit any documents you believe are relevant to supporting the service portion of your annual review form. This might include letters of thanks, letters of appointment, and the like.

      If you have the understanding that your contribution will be evaluated on some other basis than the normal 40-40-20 weighting of research, teaching, and service, please confirm such understandings with the chair when you submit your annual review materials.

On a final note, the Advisory Committee uses a rating of 0 to 10 to rate each faculty member on research, teaching, and service; a weighted average (40-40-20) is used to provide the overall rating. The committee is working under instructions to reserve ratings of 9 or 10 only for truly exceptional performance and that ratings of "good" (4-6) should often be the norm and should not be viewed as a negative rating. Any scores of 3 or below are considered marginal or unsatisfactory and would require the chair to take corrective action.

Advisory Committee Evaluation Guidelines from POLS Bylaws and Practices

Teaching/Advising: Evaluation of teaching performance is based on available student evaluations (see Appendix A), course syllabi, examinations and related information. Excellence in teaching is indicated by favorable quantitative feedback scores, positive student comment sheets, student and peer letters on classroom performance, reports of extensive supervising of student research activities, mentoring and advising students, and other teaching-related activities outside of the classroom, undertaking extensive teaching responsibilities, receipt of University teaching awards, seeking and attaining of grants related to teaching activities, and the peer evaluations of members of the Advisory Committee on the quality of teaching.

Research: Research performance ratings derive from the quality and quantity of research, publications, grants and papers. Excellence in research is indicated by the extent and type of research and publication, reviews from publishers and peers, citations of work, the reputation of the journal or publisher accepting an author's work, seeking and attaining research grants, and peer evaluation by members of the Advisory Committee of the quality of the research.

Service: Faculty members are evaluated in terms of the quality and quantity of their service to the Department, the College, the University, the profession, and the public at large.

Performance evaluation in the Department of Political Science is conducted by the elected Advisory Committee, consisting of four faculty members, and the chair. The Committee uses the indicators above to perform peer evaluation on the following 10-point scale: 1-2 (unacceptable), 3 (unsatisfactory), 4 (satisfactory) 5-6 (good), 7-8 (very good) to 9-10 (excellent).

2. Standards for Acceptable Performance: A tenured faculty member who receives an evaluation below four in the annual performance evaluation in any of the categories of teaching/advising, research, and service will be urged to work with the chair and advisory committee to develop a targeted faculty development plan. The plan should lead to improvements in performance to at least a satisfactory evaluation. The plan is

voluntary, but three consecutive ratings below four (i.e., failure to achieve a satisfactory rating) will lead to implementation of the University evaluation and dismissal plan.

3. Differential Allocation of Effort (DAE): The Department of Political Science expects faculty to devote equal attention to teaching and research. When evaluating faculty performance, the department applies the weights of 40 percent for teaching, 40 percent for research, and 20 percent for service to the University, community, and profession. These weights are the same for tenured and non-tenured faculty, although the department recognizes that the specific contributions of faculty members to the department's mission will differ depending on career stage.

Changes in the standards 40/40/20 allocation of effort for a set period of time can be initiated by the tenured faculty member or department chair. These changes can be short- or long-term and must correspond to changes in work-load not just evaluation criteria. Reasons for alterations can include short-term items such as funded research or longer term career-stage issues. Faculty members are not allowed to reduce their teaching or research to less than 10 percent on permanent DAE agreements. Departmental needs take precedent over individual needs when making decisions to alter a faculty member's allocation of effort; such redistribution must be consistent with the best interests of the unit. The most likely occasion for consideration of such changes is in discussion between the chair and the individual faculty member following annual performance evaluations, or sooner so that appropriate arrangements may be made at the unit level for the coverage of course offerings. Any individualized changes in faculty allocation of effort will be negotiated with the Chair and documented in the faculty member's personnel file.

Additional Guidance on Research Evaluation

The following guidelines (always subject to some fine tuning) are used to assign ratings for research:

0-3 　　　　　No publications; little or no research activity

4-5 　　　　　No publications but some genuine activity discernible (i.e. conference papers,

　　　　　Book in progress, etc.)

5-6 　　　　　One or two chapters in edited book, one article in minor refereed journal, edited
book accepted, and/or research grants applied for but not received.

6-7 　　　　　Multiple chapters in edited book, two articles in minor refereed journals, edited
book accepted or monograph submission, research grants, and /or research grants

applied for but not received

8-9   One major refereed article, major research grant, multiple minor journal publications, or edited book published, research grants, research grants applied for but not received, or a combination of these

9-10   One (or more) leading refereed article; major book acceptance or publication,
combination of multiple major (and minor) publications, grants applied for and/or received.

        On a final note, the Advisory Committee uses a rating of 0 to 10 to rate each faculty member on research, teaching, and service; a weighted average (40-40-20) is used to provide the overall rating. The committee is working under instructions to reserve ratings of 9 or 10 only for truly exceptional performance and that ratings of "good" (4-6) should often be the norm and should not be viewed as a negative rating. Any scores of 3 or below are considered marginal or unsatisfactory and would require the chair to take corrective action.