

POLITICAL SCIENCE DEPARTMENT
Faculty Performance Evaluation Standards

August 2006
(as amended October 2007)

Following is the performance rating scale that the University Compensation Committee recommends:

Rating	Rating Name	Rating Description
5	Exceptional	Performance/results consistently exceed competent levels. A high degree of proficiency is shown in most aspects of performance.
4	Commendable	Performance/results frequently exceed competent levels. A high degree of proficiency is shown in certain aspects of performance.
3	Competent	Performance/results are consistently at expected levels. Meets job requirements.
2	Development Needed	Some performance deficiencies exist. Performance Improvement Plan is to be established and improvement is required.
1	Unsatisfactory	Performance is consistently below acceptable levels. Performance Improvement Plan is to be established and immediate improvement is required.

Criteria for faculty evaluation:

TEACHING

Unless otherwise stated, one item in each level will place an individual in that level. Teaching evaluation consists of two major evaluations: student evaluations and peer evaluation. Open-ended written comments are to be submitted to students by all faculty members in the department. As part of their performance evaluation, all answers from a particular class must be included.

Student evaluation will be based on student perceptions of faculty teaching as measured by the evaluation instrument established by the department. Faculty rating will be based on the following distribution of the mean scores: 1.0 – 1.50 = Excellent Teaching; 1.51 – 1.75 = Good Teaching; 1.76-2.25 = Satisfactory Teaching; 2.26 – 4.00 = Marginal Teaching; and 4.01 – 5.00 = Unsatisfactory Teaching.

Peer evaluation will be based on basic questions such as the following:

- ≡ Is the grade discrimination reasonable compared to similar courses?
- ≡ Does the course syllabus for the general education course articulate the goals of the general education curriculum?
- ≡ Does the faculty member hold regular office hours and is available to students for consultation?
- ≡ Is the content of courses scholarly and up-to-date?
- ≡ Are the subjects treated comprehensively and in-depth?
- ≡ Are the courses well organized?
- ≡ Does the instructor use teaching methods (e.g., lectures, discussions, student presentations, audio visual, media, computers, outside speakers, field trips, service learning) that are suitable to course objectives and enhance learning?
- ≡ Does the faculty member teach a new course or make substantial improvement involving content or methodology to an existing course?
- ≡ Are the examinations and other graded assignments carefully designed, and do they provide a fair assessment of student learning?
- ≡ Are the examinations, assignments, and papers such that they foster analytical/critical thinking skills?
- ≡ Are the courses intellectually demanding but appropriate to the course level?
- ≡ Do the course syllabi discuss topics specified in the Faculty Handbook?
- ≡ How many student advisees does a faculty member have? Does the faculty member play a significant role as a program director, or an advisor/mentor to undergraduate and/or graduate students?
- ≡ How many graduate theses or independent studies does the faculty member supervise?
- ≡ Recognition of teaching by an outside state or national organization
- ≡ The teaching load of the faculty member

Course requirements will also be evaluated, taking into consideration class level and class size.

Note: Evidence of unsatisfactory teaching as outlined in Rating 1 shall adversely affect eligibility for Rating 3 through 5 in teaching.

Rating 5: Exceptional

- ≡ Excellent or good student perceptions of teaching performance and excellent peer evaluation of teaching and teaching materials.
- ≡ Publication of well reviewed textbook, pedagogically oriented publications or other teaching material, and satisfactory peer and student evaluation.
- ≡ Publication of an instructor's manual and good peer and student evaluation.

Rating 4: Commendable

- ≡ Good student perception of teaching performance and good peer evaluation of teaching and teaching materials.

- ≡ Receiving a university grant for curriculum development, funding for result, faculty development related to teaching, etc. and satisfactory student and peer evaluation.

Rating 3: Competent

- ≡ Satisfactory student perception of teaching performance and satisfactory peer evaluation of teaching and teaching materials.

Rating 2: Development Needed

- ≡ Marginal student perception of teaching performance and marginal peer evaluation of teaching and teaching materials.
- ≡ Unsatisfactory student perception of teaching performance, unsatisfactory peer evaluation of teaching and teaching materials, and attendance at workshop(s) related to teaching, instructional technology, short computer courses.

Rating 1: Unsatisfactory

Demonstrated pattern in one or a combination of the following categories.

- ≡ Unsatisfactory student evaluations and substantiated complaints.
- ≡ Unsatisfactory grade discrimination.
- ≡ Unsatisfactory peer evaluation of teaching and teaching materials.
- ≡ Evidence of unsatisfactory advising and tutoring.
- ≡ Failure to keep office hours.
- ≡ Habitual absences or tardiness in classes.
- ≡ Failure to keep accurate class records.
- ≡ Failure to revise and update courses.

RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

Unless otherwise stated, one item in each level will place an individual in that level. Publication of a scholarly book by a reputable press will be eligible for ratings for 2-4 years. If a faculty has more than two article-length manuscripts accepted for publication in a refereed journal in a particular year, or more than one article-length manuscript accepted for publication in, what could be argued to be, a top journal in one's field in a particular year, he/she may count those additional articles towards ratings in the next 2-4 years.

Faculty who have three hours of reassigned time for research are encouraged to present one paper annually at an academic convention and should publish one refereed article, book chapter or the equivalent” every two years, or a book every four to five years.

Faculty who have six hours of reassigned time for research are encouraged to present two

papers annually at an academic convention and should publish one refereed article, book chapter or the equivalent every year or a book every two to three years.

Rating 5: Exceptional

- ≡ Publication of a scholarly book (including some textbooks) by a reputable press
- ≡ Publication of two or more article-length manuscripts (or their equivalent) in a refereed journal as a sole or lead author
- ≡ Publication of an article-length manuscript (or its equivalent) in, what could be argued to be, a top journal in one's field (the faculty member is responsible to make this argument)
- ≡ Receipt of a major grant or external funding for research from a major foundation/agency such as the National Science Foundation, The Ford Foundation, The MacArthur Foundation, and other organizations of similar stature.

Rating 4: Commendable

- ≡ Publication of an article or research note (or its equivalent) in a refereed professional journal
- ≡ Editor of a book or national professional journal.
- ≡ Publication of a chapter in an edited work published by a reputable refereed university or commercial press.
- ≡ Published applied research, e.g., reports, research protocols, technical reports, and successful grant applications (See Tenure and Promotion Policies).
- ≡ Submitting an external grant application for research from a major foundation/agency such as the National Science Foundation, The Ford Foundation, The MacArthur Foundation, and other organizations of similar stature.

Rating 3: Competent

- ≡ Recipient of a major internal award for research or scholarly activity such as a Summer Faculty fellowship, university research grant, international research development grant, faculty development grant related to research, etc.
- ≡ Referee for professional publication or funding agencies.
- ≡ Paper presented at national or international level.
- ≡ Discussant at a national or international conference.
- ≡ Recipient of an award for a publication from a state or national source.
- ≡ Publishing a book review in a scholarly publication or a discipline related article in a popular publication.
- ≡ Evidence of applied research in progress.

Any two of the following items earns a Rating 3:

- ≡ Presentations of paper at local or state professional meetings or meetings on campus.
- ≡ Reception of sabbatical leave, including submission to department of a report on the leave.
- ≡ Attendance at a professional meeting that draws nationally.

- ≡ Receipt of a Missouri State faculty research grant or small off- campus grant or foundation support.
- ≡ Major panelist at a non-academic professional meeting.
- ≡ Attending a workshop on research grants, grant writing, etc.

Rating 2: Development Needed

- ≡ No publication activity and attendance, but not participation, at a professional meeting.

Rating 1: Unsatisfactory

- ≡ No evidence of research or scholarly activity as described in ratings 2-5 above.

SERVICE

Unless otherwise stated, one item in each level will place an individual in that level.

Rating 5: Excellent

- ≡ Meet criteria for “Commendable Service” (Rating 4)

AND ONE OF THE FOLLOWING

- ≡ Service as a major officer in a national or state professional organization and/or in a public sector agency.
- ≡ Serving as any faculty senate officer. e.g. Chairperson, Chairperson-Elect, etc.
- ≡ Principal contributor to a major accomplishment of the department, the university, or the community, e.g., being the major organizer of a professional conference.
- ≡ Serving as chair of a major university committee or college council (Teacher Education., Graduate Council, etc.).

Rating 4: Commendable

- ≡ Meet criteria for “Competent Service” (rating 3)

AND ONE OF THE FOLLOWING

- ≡ Exceptional contribution to departmental, college, and/or university committees (it is the faculty member’s obligation to provide evidence of this contribution)
- ≡ Active member of major university committee (Teacher Education Committee, Graduate Council, College Council, Faculty Senate, Budget and Priorities Committee, etc.).
- ≡ Coordinating workshops, Model UN, Moot Court, Post-Election Conference, serving as a department’s web master, etc.).
- ≡ Making a significant contribution in a professional capacity in a community, state or regional activity.

- ≡ Chairing an extra-departmental committee within the university.
- ≡ Unpaid professional consulting activities (must document nature and extent of activities).
- ≡ Service as a director/coordinator of a graduate program in the department. The department head may up-grade or down-grade rating based on his/her evaluation of quality of service provided by director/coordinator.
- ≡ Planning/Organizing a major conference or event

Rating 3: Competent

- ≡ Service on, and expected contribution to, departmental, college and/or university committees.

AND ONE OF THE FOLLOWING

- ≡ Significant contribution to departmental, college, and/or university committees (it is the faculty member's obligation to provide evidence of this contribution)
- ≡ Advisor to university student organizations.
- ≡ Giving a presentation to a community organization.
- ≡ Active professional participation in and/or contribution to a campus or community organization or institution.
- ≡ Active participation with media in area of expertise, including acceptance for publication of an article or book review in the local newspaper.
- ≡ Volunteering one's service to community organization(s).
- ≡ Making a contribution that helps enhance the public affairs mission of the university.
- ≡ Panel chair at a national or international conference.

Rating 2: Development Needed

- ≡ Evidence of poor performance in the service activities outlined in Ratings 3-5 and either
 - ≡ Attending department and college sponsored events and activities.
- or
- ≡ Participating in commencement ceremonies at least once a year.

Rating 1: Unsatisfactory

- ≡ Refusal to serve on departmental, college or university committees without good reason.
- ≡ (failure to attend committee meetings, lack of attention to responsibilities, etc.).