

Departmental Governance By-Laws
Approved by a vote of the faculty, Spring 2000 (Amended Spring 2003)

Preamble This proposal is designed to ensure continued academic and pedagogic excellence, embody our commitment to intellectual and demographic diversity, and promote the collective well-being of the department. We believe the following governing structure well designed for achieving those ends. All provisions in this proposal shall be interpreted consistently with this commitment to excellence, diversity, and collective well-being."

1. **Powers and Responsibilities:** Major departmental decisions shall be made by the Chair in consultation with an Executive Committee. Specifically,
 - a. The Executive Committee must consent and advise regarding all departmental tenure track searches and the composition of their search committees. Further,
 - i. The recruitment committee shall submit a majority and, where relevant, dissenting reports to the general faculty at a meeting scheduled by the Chair.
 - ii. The faculty at that meeting shall determine which candidate(s) shall be submitted to the general faculty for a vote.
 - b. The Executive Committee must advise and consent on all major program changes and major changes in faculty responsibilities.
 - c. With the exception of the salary committee which shall be elected by the faculty, the Executive Committee shall appoint members to all other department committees and to other outside committees which seeks department representation. The Department will continue to observe standard election procedures to select representatives to the Campus Senate, the BSOS Academic Council, and other similar bodies. The Director of Undergraduate Studies and Director of Graduate Studies will have the power to appoint subcommittees to the undergraduate and graduate studies committees, respectively.
 - i. The Executive Committee may establish subcommittees for any task the chair or committee think appropriate.
 - d. The Associate Chair, the Director of Undergraduate Studies, and the Director of Graduate Studies shall be appointed by the Chair and confirmed by a majority vote of the elected members of the Executive Committee.

- e. The Chair shall consult with the Executive Committee on budgetary matters and share the annual departmental budget at a designated meeting. (Amended 2003).
 - f. The Chair or any member can bring any other departmental business to the committee.
 - g. The Chair and the Executive Committee have the power to interpret these rules. Any major interpretation should be included in the minutes of the committee.
2. **Composition:** The Executive Committee shall be composed of 8 members and the Chair of the Department, who shall preside over the committee.
- a. Six of the members of the executive committee shall be elected in May of the proceeding year. All and only all tenured faculty, tenure track faculty or permanent instructors shall be eligible to serve on the executive committee, though no person with less than a half time appointment will be eligible in any year where the appointment is less than half time. The first year of the committee, there will be a special election at the time the faculty passes this ‘constitutional change.’ That election shall take place within 4 weeks of the passage of these rules and will be for the membership of the Executive Committee for the rest of the academic year.
 - i. All faculty have the right to take their name off the ballot for the executive committee, and must be given a week’s notice before deciding whether to stand for election.
 - b. Only tenured faculty, tenure track faculty or permanent instructors shall be eligible to vote. A cumulative voting system shall be used. Each faculty member will get six votes. Faculty may give six votes for one candidate, one vote to six candidates or any other combination.
 - c. The six candidates with the most votes shall be elected.
 - d. The other two members of the committee shall be the Director of Undergraduate Studies and the Director of Graduate Studies.
 - e. Unless, the executive committee adopts other voting rules, all executive committee decisions shall be made by majority vote, with the chair authorized to make or break ties.
3. The executive committee shall meet regularly, at least twice a month during the fall and spring semesters. At other times, meetings will be held as needed with arrangements made to accommodate members off-campus.

4. The Executive Committee shall after all meetings promptly circulate the minutes to the faculty.
5. These rules shall be brought forward to the faculty for review by the Chair every 5th year. The next review shall occur in Academic Year 2007-08. (Amended 2003).
6. Approval--This Departmental Governance proposal must be approved by secret ballot by 2/3s of the full membership of the faculty of Department of Government and Politics.
7. This Departmental Governance proposal may be amended by secret ballot by 2/3s of the faculty of Department of Government and Politics.

Department of Government and Politics
Departmental Procedures on Promotion and Tenure

1. MEMBERSHIP IN THE DEPARTMENT

Regular Member of the Faculty

Consistent with the definition of a faculty member set forth in the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences plan of organization and the rules of the Faculty Senate, regular members of the department are full-time university appointees holding the academic rank of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor. Their principal duties are teaching and research, supervision, advising and administration.

Persons holding a joint appointment within the university are considered regular faculty members of the Department of Government and Politics if their appointments within the department are at least half-time, and they are full-time employees of the University of Maryland, College Park. Faculty members on approved leave and faculty who are not employed by the university during the summer, retain regular faculty member status during those periods of absence.

Regular faculty members are eligible to serve on standing departmental committees and have voting rights in departmental affairs

Visiting, Adjunct, and Affiliate Members of the Faculty

Visiting faculty members, adjunct professors and affiliate members of the faculty are invited to participate fully within the department. The only limitation is that they may not vote in departmental meetings.

2. DEPARTMENTAL GUIDELINES for APPOINTMENTS, TENURE and/or PROMOTION amended on 9/20/06.

An award of tenure and/or promotion to a member of the faculty should reflect the objectives for the University as the flagship institution of the State of Maryland. As described in the 1988 Statute reorganizing higher education in Maryland, the University of Maryland system should “maintain and enhance the College Park campus as the State’s flagship campus with programs and faculty nationally and internationally ranked for excellence in research and the advancement of knowledge.”

This document provides our procedures for implementing the University’s guidelines for first-level review of candidates for appointment, promotion and tenure. An award of tenure and/or promotion, moreover, reflects the University’s policies as appear in the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure manual.

First-level Review. As specified in our Plan of Organization, for each candidate for tenure and/or promotion, the Department of Government and Politics selects a Promotion and Tenure Committee consisting of three of our faculty members at the rank of Associate or Full Professor. This committee assembles all the necessary information and presents it to the faculty for discussion and vote. As per University guidelines, all tenured associate and full professors vote on candidates for promotion to associate professor with tenure. All full professors vote on candidates for promotion to full professor.

Summary of Criteria for Promotion and Tenure to the Rank of Associate Professor. Faculty must have made significant contributions to scholarship, including research, teaching, and service. Scholarly research involves the advancement of knowledge, a critical requirement of faculty at a research institution. Teaching involves the communication of knowledge to undergraduate and graduate students, another crucial role faculty play at a public institution. Service activities, which enrich the lives of disciplines, academia, and communities, are also an integral part of faculty responsibilities.

A. Research and Scholarship

Every member of the faculty has the obligation to achieve excellence in his or her scholarly research. Evaluation of active and productive research programs should, whenever possible, be based on objective criteria. Among the measures excellence in research and scholarship are the following:

- (1) Research activities: quantity and quality of peer-reviewed publications. Outlets include prestigious journals (as defined by major organizations in the field and/or acceptance/rejection rates); book chapters in prestigious edited volumes or handbooks; and books with prestigious presses.
- (2) Funded research activity: quantity and quality of research grants and grant activities.
- (3) Evidence of the ability to work independently or to take the lead in the publication and presentation of results.
- (4) Peer recognition, as evidenced in citation rates and other impact indices, such as honors and awards for scholarship.
- (5) Presentation of research results at professional conferences or other universities.

B. Teaching, Advising, and Mentoring

Every member of the faculty also has the obligation to achieve excellence in his or her teaching, advising, and mentoring of students. Evaluation of such excellence should, whenever possible, be based on objective criteria. Among the measures of excellence in teaching are the following:

- (1) Student evaluations of classroom instruction at the undergraduate and graduate levels.
- (2) Teaching of service courses and development of new courses and approaches.
- (3) Quantity and quality of undergraduate student counseling in specialized courses, advanced courses, and in directing honors theses.
- (4) Quantity and quality of graduate student mentorship: training of PhD's.
- (5) Honors and awards for teaching, advising, and mentoring.

C. Service

Finally, every member of the faculty has the obligation to perform service for the department, profession, university, and general public. Evaluation of such excellence should, whenever possible, be based on objective criteria. Among the measures of excellence in service are the following:

- (1) Service to the Department: Administrative appointments within the department and membership on departmental committees. Evaluations should take account of the importance of committees, time required to serve on committees, and performance of duties few other members of the department are willing to undertake.

(2) Service to the College-Campus-University: Election to and service in College-Campus-University deliberative bodies, elective appointment to and service in College-Campus-University committees.

(3) Service to the Profession: Time given to service on professional committees, time given to prepare scholarly evaluations, review of manuscripts, editorial board memberships and editorships.

(4) Service to the General Community: Public lectures, expert testimony before congressional or state legislative committees, service on public advisory boards and task forces, significant pro bono contributions to governments at every level.

(5) Honors and awards for service.

Summary of Criteria for Promotion and Tenure to the Rank of Full Professor. Faculty must have made significant contributions to scholarship, including research, teaching, and service. Scholarly research involves the advancement of knowledge, a critical requirement of faculty at a research institution. Teaching involves the communication of knowledge to undergraduate and graduate students, another crucial role faculty play at a public institution. Service activities, which enrich the lives of disciplines, academia, and communities, are also an integral part of faculty responsibilities.

A. Research and Scholarship

Every member of the faculty has the obligation to achieve excellence in his or her scholarly research. Evaluation of active and productive research programs should, whenever possible, be based on objective criteria. Among the measures excellence in research and scholarship are the following:

- (1) Research activities: quantity and quality of peer-reviewed publications. Outlets include prestigious journals (as defined by major organizations in the field and/or acceptance/rejection rates); book chapters in prestigious edited volumes or handbooks; and books with prestigious presses.
- (2) Funded research activity: quantity and quality of research grants and grant activities.
- (3) Evidence of the ability to sustain a major research program.
- (4) Peer recognition, as evidenced in citation rates and other impact indices, such as honors and awards for scholarship.
- (5) Presentation of research results at professional conferences or other universities.

B. Teaching, Advising, and Mentoring

Every member of the faculty also has the obligation to achieve excellence in his or her teaching, advising, and mentoring of students. Evaluation of such excellence should, whenever possible, be based on objective criteria. Among the measures of excellence in teaching are the following:

- (1) Student evaluations of classroom instruction at the undergraduate and graduate levels.
- (2) Teaching of service courses and development of new courses and approaches.

(3) Quantity and quality of undergraduate student counseling in specialized courses, advanced courses, and in directing honors theses.

(4) Quantity and quality of graduate student mentorship: recruitment, training, and placement of PhD's.

(5) Honors and awards for teaching, advising, and mentoring.

(6) Mentoring junior faculty

C. Service

Finally, every member of the faculty has the obligation to perform service for the department, profession, university, and general public. Evaluation of such excellence should, whenever possible, be based on objective criteria. Among the measures of excellence in service are the following:

(1) Service to the Department: Administrative appointments within the department and membership on departmental committees. Evaluations should take account of the importance of committees, time required to serve on committees, and performance of duties few other members of the department are willing to undertake.

(2) Service to the College-Campus-University: Election to and service in College-Campus-University deliberative bodies, elective appointment to and service in College-Campus-University committees.

(3) Service to the Profession: Time given to service on major and significant professional committees, time given to prepare scholarly evaluations, review of manuscripts, editorial board memberships and editorships.

(4) Service to the General Community: Major and significant public lectures, expert testimony before congressional or state legislative committees, service on public advisory boards and task forces, and pro bono contributions to governments at every level.

(5) Honors and awards for service.

See attached revisions/amendments
Merit Pay Policy

c:(Dept Governance-By Laws) GVPTbylaws+.2005.doc

**Department of Government and Politics
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland
Adopted May 11, 2007**

Norms and Processes for Promotion and Tenure

Consistent with our goal of becoming a top-twenty department of political science, we hold ourselves to high standards for promotion and tenure. We only hire junior faculty who we expect to compile tenurable records. We expect our untenured faculty to strive for easy cases, not simply to hope that they can slide over a minimal threshold. The college and campus also look warily on guaranteeing lifetime employment to doubtful cases. The university thus encourages scholarship in the most competitive and most visible journals and presses.

As we advise and mentor our junior faculty, we need to be conscious of the standards for promotion and tenure at UMD and to communicate them openly and honestly. We can all agree on the broadly-defined measures of excellence in research, teaching, and service that appear in our *2005-2006 Guidelines for Appointment, Tenure, and/or Promotion*. All of us can also agree that we retain our right to make case-specific arguments when appropriate. By addressing a set of specific FAQs (frequently asked questions) that surround promotion and tenure, this document aims at a useful middle ground.

What Norms Should Tenured Faculty Communicate to Their Junior Colleagues?

1. One source of confusion is the following: As tenured members of the Department, all of us have our own preferences and beliefs about standards for scholarship, the relative roles of research/teaching/service, the future of the discipline, and the intellectual directions that the department should encourage. For example, with regard to the pecking order of university presses and refereed journals, many of us would accept a brilliant article in a lesser-ranked journal or a brilliant book in a lesser-ranked press as evidence of much stronger support for tenure than a “ho-hum, need more research” article in the best journal or the best press. In deciding on promotion and tenure cases, each of us might apply judgments that differ from the conclusions of the rest of the non-political science university or from current norms in the discipline.
2. There is another important source of confusion: Since untenured faculty must establish their academic credentials, the standards for senior faculty undergoing post-tenure reviews and merit/salary procedures are not necessarily the same standards for junior faculty aspiring to promotion and tenure. For example, the publication of a peer-reviewed book chapter in a university-press book might be evaluated differently for a tenured full professor than for an untenured assistant professor.
3. There is one final source of confusion: Scholarship requirements can vary across fields and subfields. Faculty usually work in areas where particular types of publications are critical to scholarly evaluations. Junior faculty are encouraged to consult with members of the discipline and their subfields about norms and standards for promotion and tenure. Fields are encouraged to meet and draw up brief descriptions of what they think constitute a body of work deserving of tenure. The field should pay special attention to its unique situation. For example, is it a field in which well-placed articles count for more than books? Is it a field with expectations of publishing at a major university press but not with expectations of publishing in certain major journals? Is it a field with expectations of publishing one’s dissertation as a university press book and also demonstrating a “second-strike” capability with a book and/or articles on a different topic?
4. When we communicate promotion and tenure standards to untenured faculty we should be aware of these ambiguities. In particular, one’s personal experiences with tenure, here and elsewhere, and one’s personal preferences for standards for tenure do not necessarily reflect current college and campus standards. Members of the department who have served on promotion and tenure committees at levels beyond the department should share their experiences with faculty who have not.

5. This said, junior faculty must be encouraged to prioritize activities that will enhance their chances for tenure. They should be made aware of those scholarly activities that count the most for tenure. Articles in refereed journals, especially those that appear in top-tier outlets, and books with university presses, are weighted heavily in evaluations by the university and by many scholars in the discipline. Junior faculty should also be made aware of those scholarly activities that count for much less, again in the eyes of the university and of many scholars in the discipline. Edited books, book chapters, and onerous levels of professional service (e.g., organizing conferences) will not likely be rewarded highly in the tenure and promotion process. As per university guidelines, teaching and departmental/college/university service (including dissertation committee work) will be rewarded as well as scholarship, but make no mistake: We are a research university with a relatively light teaching load, and thus a strong scholarly record is a necessary condition for promotion and tenure.

How Much Time Do Candidates Need and How Much Time Is On Their Clocks?

1. Junior faculty should be aware of how long it takes to prepare a university-press book that is crucial – indeed the centerpiece - of their tenure case. External letters for a tenure decision are sought at the beginning (during the summer) of the sixth year. The best way to understand these time constraints is to work backwards. For example,

Time	Year	Academic Event	Book Publishing
Year 1	03/04	arrival	prepare
Year 2	04/05		prepare
Year 3	05/06		submit to press, review, revise, accept
Year 4	06/07		copy-edit, appear
Year 5	07/08		book reviews
Year 6	08/09	tenure decision	
Year 7	09/10	up or out	

In other words, a university press could take *at least* a year to review a submitted manuscript, including its revisions, before the press sends the author an acceptance letter. The press could take *at least* another year before it copy-edits and produces the manuscript. After the book has been published, it could take *at least* another year before the book is reviewed in major academic journals.

2. Pipeline issues do not pertain only to books. Many journal articles take years from submission to publication. While book manuscripts should optimally be submitted by year 3, the majority of peer-reviewed journal articles should also be under review no later than year 4.

3. Junior faculty should also be aware of the pipeline issues involved in building certain forms of intellectual capital. Extending the fieldwork done in one’s dissertation could involve acquiring additional language skills and building personal contacts and social networks. Extending the statistical or formal work done in one’s dissertation could involve acquiring greater levels of technical sophistication and mathematical expertise. If time spent on such activities result in publications after tenure, it will be time spent on publications that will not count in the tenure decision. Candidates thus need to organize their time carefully.

4. Junior faculty should be encouraged to take their course releases or pre-tenure sabbatical leaves during their first three years on the clock. The University allows the tenure-clock to stop for certain activities (e.g., pregnancy, health). If a junior person’s research agenda is unexpectedly interrupted, the mentorship committee and the Chair should be consulted immediately.

How Should Departmental Committees Function?

1. For each junior faculty member, we appoint a 3-person mentorship committee. This committee is often selected from the original search committee, often becomes the third-year review committee and, eventually, the promotion and tenure committee. Since senior faculty serve on more than one committee,

role conflict can occur. Do committee members represent themselves, the candidate, their departmental field, the department as a whole, the university, the discipline, or some other audience? In general:

a. Search committees look for the best available job candidate. We expect all candidates who become Assistant Professors to be qualified eventually to meet stiff criteria for promotion and tenure. In other words, we recruit for tenure-track positions and hire only those whom we believe will compile tenurable records.

b. Mentorship committees are advocacy committees. Faculty who serve on these committees are likely to be boosters or supporters of the candidates, perhaps due to a coincidence of approach or subfield. When they serve on these committees, senior faculty are expected to be supportive of junior faculty.

c. Promotion and Tenure Committees judge cases. Faculty who serve on these committees are there to evaluate whether or not the candidate has met certain standards for promotion and tenure. They work for the interests of the whole department and university and often face some tough issues. While candidates will inevitably have input into the composition of this committee, committee members are not there to function as cheerleaders or advocates of the candidate. They are also not expected to write promotion and tenure documents to get the department behind the candidate regardless of the strength of the case. As a general matter, a curmudgeon should be assigned to ask the difficult questions that are likely to emerge during the promotion and tenure process.

d. Third-Year Review Committees. Since these committees are transitional between Mentorship Committees and Promotion and Tenure Committees, faculty who serve on them are both advocates and judges. Faculty here provide sympathetic advice to candidates, and yet they also provide objective feedback about whether the candidate is progressing towards a tenurable record. What is required is an arms-length evaluation of junior faculty.

e. Salary Committees. These committees are not designed to assess the prospects for tenure of junior faculty. While they do not report on tenurability, their yearly feedback can alert candidates, the chair, and mentorship committees about potential strengths and weaknesses.

2. The Chair should facilitate coordination among all these committees. While the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Chair submit independent reports on the candidate, coordination is encouraged.

3. Each year oral and written feedback must be provided to junior faculty.

a. The Mentorship Committee meets with the candidate.

b. The Salary Committee and the Chair provide feedback.

c. Depending on needs, the Chair of the Department and the Chair of the Mentorship Committee meet with the candidate.

d. The Chair, depending on circumstances, could meet with the chairs of all mentorship committees to discuss common standards for promotion and tenure.

4. Each year the tenured faculty should hold an informal and open discussion about potential cases: What do we want to do, and why? In a candidate's fifth year, prior to appointment of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, this meeting chooses committees and/or advises candidates.

5. Mentoring is a two-way process. Just as mentors should be encouraged to meet with their mentees, junior faculty should be encouraged to meet with senior faculty. Junior faculty would be wise to consult with their mentors about all aspects of preparing their tenure case, including materials to be sent to external reviewers and the nature of their personal statement.

6. Mentoring is not limited to committees. Junior faculty should be encouraged to speak to a broad range of faculty, including faculty outside of their fields.

7. Mentorship committees are not “overseer” groups, constraining the candidate into molds that one or more members of the committee might believe is “good” for the candidate. Our junior faculty are adults. They should have a political sense. They should seek out advice and they should know how to discern – that is, they should have some idea as to how to distinguish good advice from bad. The best thing that can happen to junior faculty is to discover a working environment that is quite different from overly-directive dissertation committees. Or to put it another way: The worst thing that can be done to a junior faculty is to duplicate graduate student structures. This can have a retrogressive effect on scholarship, rather than a progressive, liberating one. Many current senior faculty appreciated the fact that when they were untenured there was no “committee” looking over our shoulders.

How Should Promotion and Tenure Meetings Be Conducted?

1. Professionally. Tenured faculty should come to meetings having read the relevant materials (cv, outside letters, committee reports, publications). Since the discussion must air all aspects of the case, including its strengths and weaknesses, faculty must commit to a lengthy meeting. Each promotion and tenure case deserves a separate meeting.

2. Items in a case that are red flags for higher levels need to receive close scrutiny. Departmental materials that are sent to higher levels - reports and letters from committees and the chair - should carefully and strategically confront negative comments that appear in external letters as well as other problems that may appear in the record.

How Are Outside Evaluators Selected?

1. Candidates for promotion and tenure should be aware of how outside letter writers are chosen. Five names are submitted by the candidate to the Dean via the Chair. Another five names are submitted by the Promotion and Tenure Committee to the Dean via the Chair. The Dean chooses three names from the candidate’s list, another three names from the committee’s list, and letters are solicited by the Department. In general, the Dean requires that all submitted names come from departments ranked at our level or, preferably, higher.

2. Since one day they will have to submit a list of senior scholars to evaluate their cases, junior faculty need to establish professional visibility and reputation. They should identify and meet senior scholars at outside universities in their relevant subfields. When appropriate, junior faculty should seek guidance and feedback on their research from scholars in the larger discipline.

What About Journal Rankings?

1. The College and the campus periodically ask all departments to review and revise their journal rankings. These rankings are an important element of the promotion decision. People from outside our discipline review promotion cases at the College and campus level. When they are considering the research productivity of our candidates, our journal rankings provide outside people a useful benchmark.

2. The Department uses a number of criteria to establish its journal rankings. Surveys that appear in *PS* represent the best available data for establishing the evaluative standards that prevail across the discipline. A relevant survey of journals appeared in April 2003 *PS*; presses were evaluated in June 1999 *PS*.

3. While *PS* evaluates more than 100 journals by fields and across the entire discipline, we reserve the right to stress the value of specific journals to a candidate’s subfield.

Is There a Clear Message?

1. We discussed faculty responsibility, the relation between junior faculty and various committees, and provided multiple avenues for encouragement. We distinguished the different functions of the various committees involved in the junior faculty's career. We stipulated the kind of communication that is required between senior faculty and junior faculty, and between committees and junior faculty. And we indicated that intellectual development and professional development can be different.

2. Above all, we made clear that tenure ultimately emerges from the quality of the scholarship of the junior faculty person. Here are the traps that junior faculty should avoid: Serving on too many university, college, and departmental committees; organizing too many conferences; writing too many chapters for edited volumes and papers for weak journals; taking on too many undergraduate advisees, mentees, and honor's theses; and assisting too many graduate students with their comprehensive examinations, dissertations, and job searches. Here is what junior faculty must do: Write quality books and/or articles; consult with a broad range of faculty; understand that there is a clock running, but that there may be ways to interrupt the clock; and understand that tenure requires quality research and solid, respectable teaching.

APPROVED JOURNAL RANKINGS

PSOnline – www.apsanet.org, April, 2003 The Profession; by James C. Garand, and Micheal W. Giles, pp. 293-308

APPROVED RANKING OF PRESSES

JSTOR, <http://www.jstor.org>; Wed Jan 31, 2007 Ranking the Presses: Political Scientists' Evaluations of Publisher Quality; by Larry P. Goodson; Bradford Dillman; Anil Hira. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, Vol. 32, No. 2 (Jun., 1999), pp. 257-262.

**GVPT Policy on Merit Pay
March 3, 2004 (Revised)**

I. Policy

A financial merit award to a member of the faculty should reflect that individual's contributions to the scholarly community, the department, and the university. Unlike COLA, merit pay is not divided equally, but should, without competitive ranking, be assigned to a faculty member as a reward for meritorious performance. Merit pay is to be awarded in dollar increments rather than as a percentage of salary.

Merit pay should reflect primarily an individual's published contributions during the previous calendar year. Since averaging over a series of years evens out peaks and valleys in the available merit pool, some assessment of performance in the two previous years should also be made. In-press and forthcoming work will count when it is published.

Faculty contributions should be judged in three areas: research and scholarship, teaching, and service. Only excellence should be counted toward merit pay awards. The formula for weighting the three areas may vary by individual circumstance.

A. Research and Scholarship

Every member of the faculty has the obligation to engage in scholarly research and writing, and merit pay will not be awarded for normal performance of expected duty. While merit pay for excellence in scholarly research will thus apply to those members of the faculty who excel above and beyond normal expectations, the Department recognizes that junior faculty may incur necessary lags in publications. Evaluation of such excellence should, whenever possible, be based on objective criteria. For example, the following could be ways to measure excellence in research and scholarship:

- (1) Research activities: quantity and quality of peer-reviewed publications.
- (2) Funded research activity: quantity and quality of research grants and grant activities.
- (3) Awards and honors for scholarship.

B. Teaching

Every member of the faculty has the obligation to perform his/her teaching duties conscientiously, and merit pay will not be awarded for normal performance of expected duty. Merit pay for excellence in teaching will thus apply to those members of the faculty who excel above and beyond normal expectations. Evaluation of such excellence should, whenever possible, be based on objective criteria. For example, the following could be ways to measure excellence in teaching:

- (1) Student evaluations.
- (2) Teaching of service courses and development of new courses and approaches.
- (3) Quantity and quality of undergraduate student counseling in specialized courses, advanced courses, and in directing honors theses.
- (4) Quantity and quality of graduate student mentorship: recruitment, training, and placement of Ph.D's.

(5) Awards and honors for teaching.

C. Service

Every member of the faculty has the obligation to conscientiously perform his/her service to the department, university, profession, and general public, and merit pay will not be awarded for such performance of expected duty. Merit pay for excellence in service will thus apply to those members of the faculty who excel above and beyond normal expectations, for example, to those performing departmental administrative responsibilities not already adequately compensated by course release and stipend. Evaluation of such excellence should, whenever possible, be based on objective criteria. For example, the following could be ways to measure excellence in service:

(1) Service to the Department: Administrative appointments within the Department and membership on departmental committees. Compensation should take account of the importance of committees, time required to serve on committees, and performance of duties few other members of the department are willing to undertake.

(2) Service to the College-Campus-University: Election to and service in College-Campus-University deliberative bodies, elective appointment to and service in College-Campus-University committees.

(3) Service to the Profession: Time given to service on professional committees, time given to prepare scholarly evaluations, review of manuscripts, editorial board memberships and editorships.

(4) Service to the General Community: Public lectures, expert testimony before congressional or state legislative committees, service on public advisory boards and task forces, significant pro bono contributions to practical government at Federal, state, and local levels.

(5) Honors and awards for service.

II. Procedure

A. Collection of data

At the time of evaluation for merit pay, every member of the faculty should have had a chance to review and correct his/her Faculty Activity Report and vitae. These documents, together with teaching evaluation data, should serve as the basis for merit pay evaluation. For all three areas, faculty members can supply supporting evidence, including programs, publications, and unsolicited letters of support. The chair and/or the salary committee may request additional documentation.

B. Salary Committee

The Department shall elect a Salary Committee of five (5) members by secret ballot for a one year term. The Executive Committee will present a slate of at least five (5) candidates, although faculty may nominate and vote for candidates not on the slate. Faculty shall vote for five (5) nominees, no more than two (2) from any one rank. At least one (1) member of the Salary committee must be from each rank, and a run-off election will be held if this requirement is not satisfied. The Salary Committee should reflect, insofar as possible, the gender and racial composition of the department as well as the various sub-fields within the discipline. Members of

the Salary Committee are not eligible for immediate reelection but may serve after one year's hiatus.

The committee elected in the early Spring semester will assume responsibilities for salary evaluations in late Spring. The Chair will call the first meeting of the committee. The committee elects its own chair. Members of the Salary Committee will be evaluated by the remaining four members of the committee.

After each member of the Salary Committee has reviewed the relevant merit pay data and made an independent evaluation, the Salary Committee will meet and jointly evaluate each member of the departmental faculty and assign to him/her a rating in each of the three areas of research and scholarship, teaching, and service.

Members of the Salary Committee will evaluate each faculty member based on a four-point rating: (1) unsatisfactory, (2) satisfactory, (3) merit, and (4) special merit. For the majority of the faculty, who will perform their duties conscientiously in at least one or perhaps two areas without, however, the special excellence that serves as the basis for merit pay, committee members should note simply "satisfactory" in the respective area. For those deserving merit pay in one or more areas, committee members should note either "merit" or "special merit" in the relevant area.

Any differences among the independent evaluations of the committee members should be discussed and resolved on the basis of the standards enunciated in this policy.

C. Dissemination

Individual evaluations and cumulative committee evaluations should be reported to the Chair. The Committee and the Chair must meet to discuss the committee's evaluations.

The committee shall report its final results with a written justification of its general standards for assigning four-point ratings. It must also provide a written justification of each faculty member's ratings that further serves as a record of the committee's deliberations.

The report of the Salary Committee will be forwarded to the Chair, who will consider it in making his/her merit pay recommendations to the Dean. The Chair must report his/her final salary recommendations to the Salary Committee. Thereafter, the Chair must inform each faculty member of both the committee's evaluation and the Chair's decision, and be available to discuss both with the faculty member.

D. Appeals

Faculty members who object either to the committee's evaluation or the Chair's decision (or both), can appeal to the Salary Committee and the Chair for reconsideration. Each faculty member has the right to request the Salary Committee and the Chair to review his/her salary to determine if there is an equity problem.