

Department of Political Science
Procedures and Standards for Annual and Five-year Peer Reviews of Tenured Faculty
Approved by the Department of Political Science on August 24, 2012
Approved by CLAS August 30, 2012

Political Science expects the members of its faculty to continue throughout their careers to teach and advise undergraduate and graduate students; to serve the department, the college, the university, and the profession; and to produce and disseminate scholarship.

Annual Review Procedures. The University of Iowa requires annual reviews of tenured faculty. For the CLAS procedures for Annual Review of Tenured Faculty Review, as approved by the Office of the Provost in 2012, see <http://clas.uiowa.edu/faculty/annual-review-tenured-faculty>.

In the Department of Political Science, the DEO conducts the annual review in consultation with the tenured members of the Department's Executive Committee. The Executive Committee consists of four faculty members elected by the department, three of which are tenured and one of which is untenured. Only the three tenured faculty members could be consulted by the DEO for the purpose of the annual reviews. The DEO will inform each faculty member of the results of their individual review in writing.

Five-year Review Procedures. The University of Iowa requires regular formal reviews of how well tenured faculty members are fulfilling these tasks. Under the UI and CLAS procedures for Tenured Faculty Review, each tenured faculty member will be reviewed by his/her peers every five years; a completed review for promotion to a higher tenured faculty rank resets the clock for a Five-year Peer Review.

A committee composed of two tenured departmental colleagues assesses the faculty member's record. The committee seeks the advice of all departmental colleagues. The faculty member under review may append a response to the committee's report.

Peer reviews of tenured associate professors must address progress toward promotion to the rank of full professor. Political Science wants its associate professors to compile as quickly as possible records that justify promotion, meeting the criteria listed elsewhere. As appropriate, the report should provide the faculty member under review with advice in making such progress, or should recommend to the DEO that the candidate be encouraged to apply for promotion.

For the CLAS procedures for Five-year Peer Review of Tenured Faculty, as approved by the Office of the Provost in 2012, see <http://clas.uiowa.edu/faculty/faculty-appointments-review-tenured-faculty-review>. For the University policies governing Five-year Peer Reviews, see Chapter 10 of the Operations Manual <http://www.uiowa.edu/~our/opmanual/iii/10.htm>.

Purpose of Faculty Review. The primary purpose of each faculty review is constructive communication within the department about how to appreciate and improve the faculty member's contributions to the department, the university, and external constituencies. The secondary purpose is constructive communication with the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences about the department's ongoing work.

Departmental expectations for annual review and standards for peer reviews seek to be consistent with university and collegiate criteria for achieving tenured faculty ranks, criteria that supersede departmental standards for peer reviews should any differences emerge. Standards should be interpreted with flexibility, recognizing that there are cycles in a faculty member's career and that the department's needs also may vary.

Expectations and Standards for Tenured Faculty Review

Political Science establishes the following expectations, consistent with CLAS criteria for faculty rank (<http://clas.uiowa.edu/faculty/faculty-appointments-review-clas-criteria-tenure-track-faculty-rank>) and CLAS Standards for Tenured Faculty Rank (<http://clas.uiowa.edu/faculty/faculty-appointments-review-tenured-faculty-review#clasndrds>), to guide reviewers and responders. These flow from the Department's expectations for rank advancement, which were articulated in 2001 as follows:

Political Science expects candidates for promotion to full professor to provide clear evidence that predicts continuing scholarship high in quality and impact. This means effective teaching of undergraduate and graduate students. It means ample, effective service to colleagues and other constituencies, internal and external. Especially it means major attainments in research and publication since the initial promotion to associate professor. Political Science also expects these candidates to evidence the capacity for future productivity through such signs as research grants, data collection, conference or convention presentations, or other drafts on the way to revision and submission. For peer reviews of performance by associate professors, Political Science expects the kinds of progress that can project positive evaluations for promotion. And for peer reviews of performance by full professors, Political Science expects accomplishments of the kinds that continue to mean full careers of successful scholarship.

Political Science's expectations are high--we value, and remain committed to maintaining, our reputation for excellence throughout the discipline and across the University. Implicit in the rank expectations above is the belief that each year's performance must be interpreted in the context of the years preceding it and those to come. This is particularly so with regard to research, since almost all projects will take longer than a year from their initial conception to the publication of the final written outcome.

Teaching

Teaching Expectations for Annual Review. Political Science expects that in each year its faculty members will have taught the number of courses appropriate to their effort allocation and will have done so in accordance with University teaching policies. It expects evidence of teaching effectiveness, including course evaluations. It expects effective advising of assigned undergraduate majors. It expects supervision and mentoring of doctoral students as appropriate to the faculty member's expertise as well as appropriate participation in such departmental aspects of graduate education as grading comprehensive examinations.

Standards for Teaching in Five-year Peer Review. Political Science expects continued

strength and development in the faculty member's record of instruction. All faculty are expected

- to contribute to curriculum development in the Department,
- to regularly update courses in ways that reflect current scholarship and/or methodology in their areas, and
- to teach courses at all levels of instruction with student enrollments consistent with the level of the course, the nature of the subjects offered, and the needs of the Department and the College.

The record must show well-taught courses that respond to the department's curricular needs. A high quality of instruction must be demonstrated in part by student evaluations conducted according to university rules. The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences also mandates that the review include at least one classroom observation and that the committee examine teaching materials for the faculty member's courses. The review committee should note the incorporation of pertinent scholarship in the faculty member's teaching, and take account of responses on teaching in surveys of undergraduate majors at the end of their departmental studies.

Political Science expects a continued strong record of advising students. The review committee should point out effective preparation and performance in advising on academic skills, degree requirements and studies or careers after graduation. It also should assess the faculty member's supervision of independent work, research tutorials, honors projects, and internships. The many ways for faculty to mentor graduate students continue to be particularly important to the department's standing in the discipline.

Scholarship

Scholarship Expectations for Annual Review. Political Science expects faculty members' records for a given year to reflect productive research activity consistent with the proportion of their time devoted to research, typically 40%.

For associate professors, a given year's activities are evaluated in terms of the progress those activities represent toward the "major attainments in research and publication" that will merit promotion to full professor in a reasonable time. A reasonable time for those newly tenured is approximately six years after receiving tenure; for those beyond that mark, the DEO will discuss with the faculty member an appropriate target.

For full professors, a given year's activities are evaluated with an expectation that they will lead to continued major attainments in research and publication at a roughly similar rate. Significant changes in a faculty member's effort allocation—for instance, by those undertaking full-time administrative positions—will alter these time expectations appropriately. Political Science welcomes it when tenured faculty members undertake large-scale research activities, such as fieldwork or dataset development that, while not resulting in publications at the initial stages, make possible substantial contributions down the road. It expects these faculty members to be sharing their plans with other scholars in such forms as grant proposals or book prospectuses. It expects that they will take advantage of appropriate opportunities to share preliminary results from their work, in such forums as conferences or newsletters.

Standards for Scholarship in Five-year Peer Review. Political Science expects continuing development and visibility of the faculty member's record of scholarly work (invited or refereed), consistent with the faculty member's rank and seniority, and consistent with the disciplines and sub-disciplines engaged by the department. Recognizing that different kinds of inquiry produce distinctive rhythms of scholarship, it expects continuing publication in good peer reviewed outlets. A faculty member in the midst of a book or other multi-year project is normally expected to submit draft chapters or their equivalent for review.

Other general indicators of continued productivity are

- submitting grant and fellowship proposals,
- giving conference papers and invited lectures related to the project,
- organizing conference sessions or symposia related to the project,
- preparing and submitting a prospectus for potential publishers,
- giving state-of-the-research talks, or
- obtaining a publication contract.

The department benefits from faculty participation in professional gatherings and recognition of work high in quality. Faculty are expected to apply for internal (i.e., Collegiate or University) sources of competitive funding and external funding, appropriate to their area of study. Neither a DEO nor a review committee can micromanage the research career of a colleague, but peer reviews should provide helpful perspectives on recent attainments and continuing scholarship prospects.

Service

Service Expectations for Annual Review. Political Science expects a mix of service to the Department, the University and external constituencies, especially disciplinary institutions. This mix should reflect each faculty member's expertise or experience and will vary from year to year. Political Science interprets the concept of service broadly and does not specify certain activities. The key is that faculty members are sharing their knowledge, experiences and perspectives for the benefit of various communities. Political Science expects that tenured faculty members will engage in service to all three arenas—department, university and external—as part of their ongoing work. Although a given year's record might not involve service in one of these arenas, this should not be true across a series of years.

Standards for Service in Five-year Peer Review. Political Science expects faculty members to continue to develop their leadership and service to the department, the institution, and the profession consistent with each tenured faculty rank. Tenured faculty are expected to engage in professional service that reflects the visibility of their own scholarship and teaching. This includes work on academic and administrative committees important to the department, the college, the university, and the profession (manuscript and grant reviewing, editing, scholarly journals, organizing sessions at professional conferences, serving as officer of a professional association, or other service roles appropriate to the discipline). It includes administrative, editorial, intellectual, and community offices and other community roles. It spans disciplinary and interdisciplinary contributions. Especially it encompasses assisting colleagues and promoting the department. Again, the ambition of peer reviews is to specify useful ideas about recent accomplishments and future opportunities.