
Effective Date: 08/20/2021

Definition: A policy for the evaluation of Tenure Track Faculty within the Department of Political Science.

Authority: CSU/CFA Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement

Scope: Tenure Track Faculty within the Department of Political Science, College of Humanities, Arts, Behavioral and Social Sciences (CHABSS).

Ellen J. Neufeldt

Ellen J. Neufeldt, President

08/20/2021

Approval Date

Carl Kemnitz

Carl Kemnitz, Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs

08/16/2021

Approval Date

Implementation:* 08/20/2021

*Contains Temporary Item V. Addendum re: COVID-19

Effective Date: 08/20/2021

Table of Contents

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	3
II.	STANDARDS FOR TEACHING.....	4
	A. Overview.....	4
	B. Teaching Expectations.....	4
	C. Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness.....	5
III.	RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY.....	6
	A. Assessment of Scholarly Research/Creative Activities.....	7
	B. Areas of Achievement.....	7
IV.	SERVICE.....	10
	A. Service and Participation.....	10
	B. Levels of Engagement – Routine and Major Service Activities.....	11

Effective Date: 08/20/2021

C.	Importance	of	Narrative	and	Supporting
Evidence.....					
					13
V.	ADDENDUM	TO	POLITICAL	SCIENCE	RTP
DOCUMENT.....					
					13

I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this document is to provide guidance to Political Science faculty members as to the department’s expectations for retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP). It elaborates on the CSUSM Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion and the College Standards and Procedures for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion. It also clarifies the Political Science Department RTP standards for reviewers outside the department.

Faculty are evaluated in the areas of teaching, research/creative activity, and service. Each faculty member must develop a Working Personnel Action File (WPAF), in accordance with guidelines stated in the university and college RTP documents.

The department expects the WPAF to demonstrate the faculty member’s active engagement in their various roles as a university professor. This may be done in various ways, depending upon the interests and strengths of the faculty member, their rank and experience, and the needs of the department, college, university, and community. Nonetheless, each faculty member is expected to be actively engaged in each of the three RTP evaluation areas.

Although the areas of evaluation are consistent for all levels, expectations differ for assistant, associate, and full professors. Retention recommendations will be based on evaluation of accomplishments of the faculty member in the three areas. Tenure and promotion recommendations will be based upon evaluations of the overall record of the

**RETENTION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION STANDARDS -
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE****POLICY
FAC 772-20**

Effective Date: 08/20/2021

faculty member in the three areas for the entirety of the probationary period. Faculty members' accomplishments that were included in the record at the time of hiring or prior promotion are not to be considered in subsequent evaluations, other than as evidence of performance continuity, unless service credit was awarded at hiring. At every review, probationary faculty should clearly chart their progress toward the standards for tenure and promotion, as described below. Additionally, faculty are expected to respond explicitly in subsequent WPAFs to feedback offered in prior reviews.

Faculty members under review are to describe their activities in language that is clear and accessible to those outside their field of study, and to minimize, where possible, jargon or terminology that is highly specialized. If such jargon is unavoidable, the faculty member should explain the meaning of the terminology as clearly as possible.

Political Science values the unique contributions made by joint appointments with collaborating departments. The department has several joint appointments and will likely continue this practice in the future. Faculty with joint appointments must include in their WPAF a copy of the MOU describing the terms of their joint appointment. Recognition must be made in all evaluations that joint appointments are designed to satisfy the needs of both units in accordance with the MOU between the two units. The faculty member is only expected to meet the standards of each unit related to the percentage of the appointment in that unit. The Political Science Department is committed to collaboration and working with other departments/units on campus and assisting faculty in meeting the requirements of their appointments. Faculty should clearly explain in their narrative the percentage of their appointment designated to each unit and how their contributions meet those requirements.

II. STANDARDS FOR TEACHING

A. Overview

The Political Science Department values the design, delivery, and maintenance of high quality and challenging learning environments, as well as academic freedom, course innovation, and student engagement. All faculty in the department are expected to offer high-quality courses and, as feasible, to develop new courses to assist with the delivery of the Political Science curriculum.

All faculty are expected to demonstrate effective teaching, as described below. Teaching effectiveness is multifaceted. Some of the practices and attributes that characterize effective college teaching include the possession and continuing development of discipline-specific and pedagogical knowledge; the use of varied instructional techniques; the planning, implementing, assessing, and revising of pedagogies to achieve learning objectives; and reflection on constructive feedback (e.g., from WPAF review letters, open-ended comments in student evaluations, etc.).

**RETENTION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION STANDARDS -
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE****POLICY
FAC 772-20**

Effective Date: 08/20/2021

A faculty member's narrative must demonstrate the connection between their teaching philosophy and activities within particular courses. The reflective statement should make clear how particular items in the WPAF serve as evidence of teaching effectiveness and demonstrate the nature and evolution of pedagogical practices. We expect faculty to reflect on both the "hits" and "misses" of their teaching experience, to demonstrate their thoughtful commitment to continual improvement. We recognize the importance of experimentation and the labor involved in constructing, employing, assessing and modifying curriculum. The faculty member under review should interpret qualitative and/or quantitative evaluations in order to provide the greatest insight into their teaching effectiveness.

B. Teaching Expectations

1. **Workload:** While the number of courses offered by a faculty member may vary, all faculty are expected to teach courses on a regular basis and to teach courses that serve the needs of the department. In cases of a joint appointment, the MOU will be taken into consideration.
2. **Pedagogy:** Faculty are encouraged to develop a range of teaching strategies to reach various learning styles, and to enhance the quality of interaction with and among students. Faculty are encouraged to utilize the various resources offered by the Faculty Center and Instructional and Information Technology Services (IITS) to enhance their pedagogical practices.
3. **Teaching expectations across the career path:** While the department generally holds the same expectations regarding teaching for all faculty, regardless of rank, each level of review may see different developmental stages, appropriate to one's career stage.
 - a. **Probationary Period:**
 - i. The Department expects probationary faculty to engage in critical self-reflection about their teaching, and to embrace a process of development and improvement.
 - ii. We expect faculty to enhance and expand the curriculum in the Department, where appropriate.
 - b. **Promotion to Associate Professor, Promotion to Full Professor, Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty:**
 - i. We expect a record of continued contributions to curriculum development that demonstrates a strong understanding of the needs of the Department and various student constituencies.
 - ii. We expect a sustained and ongoing commitment to best pedagogical practices.

Effective Date: 08/20/2021

C. Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

1. **Teaching Philosophy:** The department expects all faculty to define their teaching style and link it to an overarching pedagogical philosophy in their narrative statement. Faculty under review should provide additional detail about their classroom strategies and teaching style beyond their teaching evaluations and student comments.
2. **Syllabi:** The file shall include representative syllabi from courses taught during the period under review. Syllabi shall conform to the CSUSM Course Syllabus Policy.
3. **Student Evaluations:** Both the course evaluations and the comparison reports for all courses taught during the period under review shall be included in the WPAF. While student evaluations are only one piece of evidence of teaching success, it is expected that faculty will discuss in their narrative statements how their pedagogy is evolving in light of the patterns and trends apparent in their course evaluations.
4. **Classroom Observation:** Faculty may request a peer evaluation of their teaching and the written assessment may be included as evidence in the WPAF.
5. **Other Evidence:** To demonstrate teaching effectiveness, evidence beyond the required elements described above must be included and discussed in the WPAF. Examples of such evidence include, but are not limited to:
 - Samples of graded assignments, papers, and/or exams (with student name removed);
 - Samples of assignments, online discussions, papers, and class activities;
 - Examples of assessment techniques and rubrics;
 - Lecture outlines, handouts and/or slides;
 - Additional classroom observations;
 - Effective use of guest speakers, videos, performance, field trips, etc.
 - Examples of changes made in pedagogy based on feedback, assessment, additional training, etc.;
 - Participation in teaching-related workshops, pedagogical training and/or professional development with evidence of how the new information was used in teaching;
 - Student feedback other than in course evaluations;
 - Teaching awards or nominations;
 - Video or audio recording of teaching;
 - Invited guest lecture

Effective Date: 08/20/2021

III. RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY

Research/creative activities can take many forms in Political Science. The forms of research/creative activity may include, but are not limited to qualitative, quantitative, and applied scholarly research, both individual and collaborative.

These activities may be disseminated in print or in digital form and may be produced for the scholarly and policy communities as well as for the general public. The department particularly values scholarly activity which includes student and/or public engagement. The department has three primary expectations of faculty research at all ranks: 1) a clear research agenda, leading to 2) sustained scholarly results, which 3) make a significant contribution to the faculty member's area of study.

A. Assessment of Scholarly Research/Creative Activities

1. General Standards

Candidates will be assessed on the quality of the evidence provided, the evidence of sustained scholarship as part of an overarching research agenda, and the totality of their work. The candidate's body of work will be evaluated holistically, as described above. In all cases, the scholarly reputation of the dissemination venue (e.g., journal or publisher) and/or meeting will be considered when evaluating the contribution. Evidence of scholarly reputation includes, but is not limited to that a journal is peer-reviewed; the journal or conference paper acceptance rate; impact factor or citation reports; quality of the institution managing the journal.

2. Tenure and/or Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

- a. At least three items (or equivalent, as demonstrated by the candidate in the file, and explained in the narrative) from Category A.
- b. At least three items (or equivalent, as demonstrated by the candidate in the file, and explained in the narrative) from Category B.

3. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor*

- a. At least three items (or equivalent, as demonstrated by the candidate in the file, and explained in the narrative) from Category A.
- b. At least three items (or equivalent, as demonstrated by the candidate in the file, and explained in the narrative) from Category B.

*Only items not considered in the last promotion may be considered.

4. When multiple authors are present on scholarly research and creative activities, candidates shall specify their role in, or contribution to, the work, and note the conventions of their field for determining the order in which authors are listed on the final product.

Effective Date: 08/20/2021

5. Research and Teaching: As noted above, effective teaching is multifaceted. Some of the practices and attributes that characterize effective college/university teaching include the continuing development of discipline-specific knowledge and research. The statement on teaching should address the relationship between teaching and candidate's discipline-specific research.

B. Areas of Achievement

The PRC's evaluation of scholarly research/creative activities will focus on understanding the contribution, benefit, and impact of the candidate's work on the field. The candidate should explicitly present their research plan, including their short- and long-term goals. The candidate's research productivity will be evaluated by holistic or comprehensive consideration of the candidates' reflective statement, scholarly work, and selected items that candidates believe best reflect their progress, as described in the University RTP document and further illustrated below. Candidates will demonstrate effective scholarly effort by identifying and providing evidence of both major scholarly achievements (Category A), and additional achievements (Category B).

Category A: Major achievements -- this list of examples of major achievements implies no rank order, nor preference for a particular kind of achievement, nor the superiority of any listed type of achievement over another.

1. Peer-reviewed journal articles on which a faculty member's contribution was substantial, and which are published or accepted for publication. The narrative should explain the candidate's contributions and significance of the publication.
2. Scholarly book authored or edited by the faculty member.
3. Peer-reviewed book chapters published or accepted for publication to which the candidate's contribution was substantial. The narrative should explain the candidate's contributions and significance of the publication.
4. Papers published in refereed proceedings. Candidate should demonstrate the significance of the conference and its published proceedings to their discipline.
5. Scholarly monographs authored or edited by the faculty member. The narrative should explain the candidate's contributions and significance of the publication.
6. Digital Media projects in which the faculty member's contribution was substantial. The narrative should explain the relevance and contribution of the project to the discipline, and, given the evolving nature of digital scholarship, should also (to the extent possible) explain the project's subject in terms of the traditional approaches to scholarship in the discipline.

Effective Date: 08/20/2021

7. Successful externally funded grant.
8. Publication of a comprehensive textbook, anthology or source-book that synthesizes scholarship in the field. The narrative should explain the candidate's contribution and significance of the publication.
9. Publication of a policy study or working paper by a recognized national or international organization, foundation or institute. The narrative should explain the relationship of the candidate with organization, the candidate's contribution and the significance of the publication.

Regarding major achievements: The department recognizes that in many academic disciplines or fields the value of a single published scholarly book or monograph is considered to be of equal or greater significance than the standard of three items established here. It is the responsibility of the faculty member under review to clarify the value of the book and their contribution to the book (as in the case of co-authorship).

We recognize that other items may be considered major scholarly achievements or that an item from the list above should, in some cases, be considered as having greater weight in the candidate's scholarly profile than other achievements. In these cases, it is expected that the faculty member will provide evidence and arguments that make the case that an item belongs in this category. We suggest that the faculty member consult with senior faculty in the Political Science Department regarding questions about the most appropriate category for an item.

Category B: Additional achievements – example include, but are not limited to:

1. Papers published in proceedings
2. Presentations at professional meetings
3. Editor-reviewed articles published in journals, newspapers, magazines, and other media
4. Published book reviews
5. Session discussant at a professional meeting
6. Invited keynote or speaker at a professional meeting
7. Special recognition and awards for research/creative activities

Effective Date: 08/20/2021

8. Funded regional or internal grants for scholarly research/creative activity work (e.g., local organizations, University Professional Development, etc.)
9. Self-published books (related to candidate's field of study)
10. Workshop leader at scholarly or professional meeting (e.g., NEH summer seminar)
11. Unfunded peer reviewed external grants for scholarly research/creative activity work
12. Manuscripts under review
13. Research conducted as a consultant
14. Technical reports
15. Creative activity such as work on documentaries, podcasts, other virtual or digital media, etc., pertaining to political topics.

Comments about other research/creative achievements: We recognize that other items not explicitly included in Categories A or B may be considered scholarly/creative achievements. In these instances, it is expected that the faculty member will provide evidence and arguments that make the case that an item belongs in this category. We suggest that the faculty member consult with senior faculty in the Political Science Department if there are questions about the most appropriate category for an item.

IV. SERVICE

A. Service and Participation

Service activities are highly valued and are an essential component of retention, tenure and promotion evaluations. In addition to routine service (as defined below) that is required by each tenure-track faculty member, we expect that all faculty will participate in further service that is impactful and meaningful. The college has a strong tradition of faculty governance, which requires ongoing participation by a wide range of faculty; this means that faculty should plan to be active participants, which includes attending all-faculty meetings and becoming involved in governance committees at all levels.

Assistant Professors are encouraged to concentrate on departmental-level service during their first two years at the university. In the third year of the probationary

**RETENTION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION STANDARDS -
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE****POLICY
FAC 772-20**

Effective Date: 08/20/2021

period, Assistant Professors are encouraged to begin engaging in service at the college or university level; however, Assistant Professors should avoid taking on heavy service commitments (e.g., chairing shared governance committees, serving as a program coordinator/director) that could limit their success in meeting standards for tenure in teaching and research. By the time that a candidate for tenure submits their file, it is expected that they will have completed at least two years of college- or university-level service.

Associate Professors are expected to perform levels of departmental and college/university service greater than during their probationary period as Assistant Professors. Associate Professors are encouraged to engage in service leadership roles (e.g., chairing college- and university-level committees) in support of college- and/or university-level shared governance. We understand that sometimes a faculty member may apply for but not be able to serve in such positions. In those cases, the faculty should provide a brief account to that end.

Full Professors are expected to continue performing regular departmental and college/university service. Full Professors are also expected to perform major service responsibilities for which only Full Professors are eligible (e.g., Promotion and Tenure Committee), or are strongly encouraged (e.g., Department Chair).

Documentation of service should be accompanied by a discussion in the narrative of the impact of the service on the Department, College, University, community, or profession. A narrative of service impact may include a description of the nature of the work, the roles played on committees, and the outcomes of the work. Faculty should convey how the service activity is making a difference on campus, in the community, and/or in the profession. Please see point #3 below for further guidance on documentation about service.

B. Levels of Engagement – Routine and Major Service Activities

Service activities should reflect increasing levels of engagement throughout the candidate's career trajectory. The Department values service which coheres with candidates' broader goals and visions across the career trajectory, and which feeds into and supports candidates' teaching and research goals. The narrative should be used to explicate the service philosophy and to show these links. The narrative should also include discussion and evidence of service at the routine and major service levels (described below).

- 1. Routine service:** Routine service is significant and expected of every tenure-track faculty member regardless of commitments outside of the Department or University. Political Science faculty are expected to participate in routine service as part of their standard workload (15 WTUs, three of which are for routine service). Faculty who are not teaching due to grant work or outside service

**RETENTION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION STANDARDS -
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE****POLICY
FAC 772-20**

Effective Date: 08/20/2021

commitments are still expected to routinely participate in Department activities (unless on sabbatical or other personal or professional leave). On occasion, routine service might be considered more major service. For example, work on the Department curriculum committee may be quite extensive one year and would not be considered routine service. It is up to the faculty member to explain the impact and importance of the service. The following tasks are considered routine service in the Department and are expected of all faculty throughout their careers. Performance of routine service alone does not meet the requirements for retention, tenure, or promotion:

- Attendance at Department meetings
- Attendance at Departmental retreats
- General academic advising
- General mentoring of junior and PT faculty
- Ongoing curriculum maintenance (e.g., catalogue review, updating courses, etc.)
- Participating in regular program assessment activities
- Participating in the program review process
- Participating in tenure-track search process (not a search committee member)
- Attendance at the department graduation celebration
- Attendance at the annual University commencement ceremony
- Other activities may also count as routine service

- 2. Major service:** These activities are expected of tenure-track faculty members but are typically above and beyond routine service. Over time, service activity should be at the department, college and University or community levels, but may vary depending on the year and the faculty members' commitments and interests. It is expected that tenure-track faculty will take increasing leadership within these activities as they progress in their career. Examples of major service include but are not limited to:

a. *Department level*

- Department chair
- PRC membership
- Search committee membership
- Program or curriculum development beyond routine changes (e.g., preparing and submitting curricular forms for creating new courses, for changes to the major, etc.)
- Developing a major new departmental initiative
- Assessment Coordinator
- Peer classroom evaluations
- Program review activities beyond basic assessment activities
- Website maintenance
- Coordinating the graduation celebration
- Social media coordinator

Effective Date: 08/20/2021

- Student club advisor

b. *College/University level:*

- Chair or member of College or Academic Senate committees, including Executive Committee roles
- Chair of the College Faculty
- Task force or ad hoc committee participation
- Serving on steering committees
- Serving on Academic Senate
- Faculty Mentoring Program participant
- Special event chair (e.g., organizing a conference)
- Serving as external member on thesis committee
- Serving as external member on faculty or administrator review committees
- Chairing a search committee
- Serving on a search committee outside of home department
- Development of Extended Learning or other non-departmental curriculum
- Other activities may count as major College/University service

c. *Community/Professional Service level:*

- Speaker, community event
- Reviewer for journals, conferences, grants
- Professional presentations to university or community organizations
- Officer or committee member of a professional society
- Journal editor
- Board member of a journal
- Board member of an organization

C. Importance of Narrative and Supporting Evidence

The most important articulation of the scope and goals of a candidate's service activities takes place in the narrative. Candidates can provide supporting evidence which further demonstrates their service commitment in a number of ways, which may include the following:

- Committee reports where the candidate was a significant contributor
- Handouts/slides/notes from presentations
- Programs/event handouts from events which the candidate planned/helped to plan
- Copies of reviews
- Curricular forms

V. ADDENDUM TO POLITICAL SCIENCE RTP DOCUMENT

Definition: Addendum to the 2021 standards governing Retention, Tenure and Promotion for faculty in the Department of Political Science at the College of Humanities, Arts,

**RETENTION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION STANDARDS -
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE**

**POLICY
FAC 772-20**

Effective Date: 08/20/2021

Behavioral and Social Sciences (CHABSS) at California State University San Marcos (CSUSM).

Authority: The collective bargaining agreement between the California State University and the California Faculty Association.

Scope: Eligible tenure-line faculty in the Department of Political Science.

Rationale: The goal of this addendum is to address difficulties faced by faculty members in the RTP process as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, as outlined in the CSUSM ACADEMIC SENATE RESOLUTION, “Calling on Deans to task faculty with reviewing and possibly revising College/Department Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Standards to reflect impacts from the COVID-19 pandemic,” dated 12/2/20.

POLICY ADDENDUM TO POLITICAL SCIENCE RTP STANDARDS:

This addendum applies to all Political Science faculty who were employed as a tenure-track faculty member at CSUSM in the 2019-20 and 2020-21 academic years. Faculty are encouraged to consult Appendix H of the university RTP standards for additional guidance with respect to the impact of COVID-19 on the RTP process.

APPENDIX A:

Due to Covid-19 travel bans and the cancellation of many academic activities such as professional conferences, some faculty were unable to give guest lectures, present their research, serve as discussants, or perform other teaching, research/creative, and service activities as planned. If a teaching, research/creative, and service activity was scheduled and then canceled as a result of Covid-19, the candidate may choose to include such an activity in the body of evidence of fulfillment of teaching, research/creative, and service expectations. If such an activity is included in the evidence, the candidate shall articulate and reflect upon in the narrative how the canceled activity would have contributed to their fulfillment of teaching, research/creative, and service expectations, and the PRC shall take into consideration the activity in the evaluation of the candidate’s performance.