

**DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNMENT**  
**GUIDELINES FOR ANNUAL MERIT EVALUATION**  
January 2009

**I. Authority**

- A.** The Planning and Budget Committee acts as an advisory body to the Chair. The committee is expected to consult with members of the Department in formulating recommendations and to apply the guidelines, as it deems appropriate. More or less weight may be given to a particular activity as the Committee sees fit. The criteria with suggested weights listed below are to be understood as guidelines.

**II. Overview of Process**

- A. Time span:** The time span for merit evaluation in all categories is the previous academic year (i.e., September 1 to August 31). The Committee will base its evaluation on the information provided in the Annual Report filed by each member of the Department.
- B. Basic Distribution:** Forty percent of the merit increase pool recommended by the Provost will be allocated based on research. Forty percent of the merit increase pool recommended by the Provost will be allocated based on teaching and twenty percent of the pool will be allocated based on service to the department.
- C. Three Year Rolling Average:** Point totals in service, teaching and research will be averaged over the last three years. In the single case of scholarship, performance in a single year that exceeds 8 points will mean that the excess points will be carried over into the next year's merit evaluation.
- D. Points to Dollars and Points to Percentage:** Half of all points earned in scholarship, teaching and service are translated into merit raises without regard to salary and half of all points earned in scholarship, teaching and service are translated into merit raises in proportion to salary.
- E. Joint Appointments**
- a.** University policy is that the primary unit is responsible for conducting the merit review. The primary unit must solicit, take into account, and reflect the views of the secondary unit with respect to merit review and must communicate the results to the secondary unit.
  - b.** All junior tenure-track faculty must be evaluated fully by the department as well as their primary units. While the primary unit remains responsible for merit increases, this is a critical part of the evaluation process in preparation for the application for tenure and promotion from assistant to associate professor.
- F. New Faculty:** New faculty will be given the pool percentage as a percent increase in their first year. Subsequently, they will be assessed using the same three year rolling average as the rest of the faculty using the departmental average number of points in research, teaching and service for their first year of full-time employment at GU. They will also be given the departmental averages for each category for the years for which they were not evaluated by the committee. New faculty can submit research reports for their first year of full time employment at Georgetown, if they wish.

**III. Scholarship**

- A. Principles:** The scholarly activity of members of this Department inevitably takes a variety of different forms, and it results in publications that vary widely in both purpose and substance. **A premium is placed, however, on that sort of scholarship which**

**results in publication in what are commonly recognized as the sources of the more distinguished work in the field.**

- a. In the case of journals, this usually means that the purpose of the publication is primarily a scholarly one; that it is well established as a medium of scholarly inquiry; and that editorial decisions are determined primarily by a review process relying on independent, anonymous referees.
  - b. In the case of books, it usually means that the purpose of the work is primarily a scholarly one; that the publisher is an acknowledged source of distinguished scholarship in the field; and that the review process relies, once again, primarily on independent, anonymous referees.
  - c. Work published in publications and with publishers whose reputations are not well established among political scientists will typically receive low evaluations. However, members of the Department are encouraged to provide those responsible for evaluation with relevant information, on the basis of which an informed judgment can be made about quality and scholarly standing.
- B. Timing:** Credit for publication of books and articles is normally awarded based on the academic year (1 September to 31 August) in which the item was actually published. However, untenured faculty may submit articles and books earlier, in manuscript form, provided that these are accompanied by letters of acceptance from the publisher.
- C. Scales**
- a. Scholarly Books will be evaluated on the basis of the following scale: authored (1-12), edited and contributed to (0-4), edited (0-3). Books published by the profession's most prestigious peer reviewed university presses are particularly valued.
  - b. Articles appearing in journals will be evaluated on a scale ranging from 0-4. Articles published in the profession's most prestigious peer reviewed journals are particularly valued.
  - c. Book Chapters should be evaluated on a scale of 0-1.5.
  - d. Papers delivered at the meetings of professional associations or issued in *formal* working paper series will be evaluated on a scale of 0-0.25.
  - e. Book reviews and editorials may also be taken into account, and will be evaluated on a scale of 0+ with a **CAP of 0.25** for all book reviews and editorials.
  - f. Textbooks do not typically conform to the principles outlined above and therefore will be evaluated accordingly. The expectation is that compensation for textbooks and related books will be handled by the publisher. In the instances in which the lines between textbook and scholarship are indistinct, among the factors to be considered are: the target audience of the book (e.g. the committee may wish to refer to the on-line marketing of the book), whether the compensation is more consistent with textbook practices than with the treatment of scholarly book and whether the book was published by a university press. These will be evaluated on a 0 to 3 scale, with only the more scholarly and high quality examples being considered for the top of the scale.
  - g. While the Committee is to operate under the various guidelines established above, it is understood that the evaluation process is an inexact one, and that the exercise of prudential judgment will be necessary for its success.
- D. Co-authorship**
- a. Co-authored scholarship will be evaluated in light of both the efficiencies and scholarly effectiveness of collaborative work. As a general matter, an individual will be given a minimum 60% of the total points for a piece of scholarship that is

co-authored. For work with three authors, the minimum percentage will be roughly 40%, for four authors the minimum percent will be roughly 33% and so forth.

- b. Faculty will receive full credit for peer reviewed or university press publications co-authored with departmental graduate students. Faculty may also be given full credit for conference papers and non-peer reviewed publications, to the extent the publication advances the scholarly potential of the student. Co-authorship with graduate students from outside the department will generally not be given favorable treatment.
- E. **Editing of journals:** will be evaluated on a scale of 0-2.
- F. **Leave policy:** faculty will be given credit for publications appearing while on leave, but no additional points will be given (in contrast to teaching and service where average scores from previous years may be used).
- G. **Annual Cap:** The maximum number of points considered for merit increases in the scholarship category is 8. Any additional scholarship points are carried over and added to the next years points in the scholarship category.

#### IV. Teaching

**A. Classroom teaching:** The primary means of evaluating teaching effectiveness is student evaluation scores.

- a. All members are expected to provide the course evaluation forms provided by the University Registrar in all courses, including seminars, for the fall and spring semesters.
- b. These scores shall also be adjusted statistically to attenuate the potential biases that may disadvantage members of the faculty who teach lower level classes and/or large classes. Among the factors that should be considered are class size (under 20 students; 20-50 students; over 50 students), level (graduate vs. undergraduate), required course (for undergraduate majors or general requirement for graduate students) and grade distribution of each class taught.
- c. For each faculty member, average adjusted evaluation scores should be calculated in two ways: an unweighted average across all courses taught and an average across all courses weighted by class size. The overall teaching evaluation for each faculty member will be the minimum of these two average scores.

#### B. Advising

- a. Timing As a general rule, credit will be given only for theses and dissertations mentored and read in the year of their completion and defense. All such theses and dissertations should be listed, by name, in the faculty member's Annual Report.
- b. Dissertations The usual standard is that a faculty member who mentors a dissertation will, in the year of completion of that dissertation, receive 0.5 points. A reader on a Ph.D. thesis will receive 0.175 points in the year of completion.
- c. Master's theses: A mentor of a master's thesis will, in the year of completion of that thesis, receive 0.25 points, subject to a **CAP of 2.0 point**. A reader of a master's thesis will receive 0.125 points in the year of completion subject to a **CAP of 1.0 points**.

- d. Undergraduate honor's thesis (and supervision of students within an area studies certificate program) will typically be allotted 0.125 points, subject to a **CAP of 0.75 points**. No points are awarded for conducting the honors seminars.
- C. Tutorials and independent study.** To be considered for teaching points, faculty must submit a report on each tutorial, which includes the following information: a list of readings, number of meetings, number of papers, size of papers, and grading procedures. Faculty will normally receive 0.175 points for each of these activities, up to a **CAP of 0.50 per year**.
- D. Leave Policy:**
- a. In the first year, faculty will be awarded the average of their last two years' evaluations (previous 4 semesters).
  - b. In the second year, faculty will receive the lower of either the two-year average or the median within rank.
  - c. In the third year faculty will receive no points.
  - d. Computation of these teaching averages will not include points received during that period for tutorials or thesis mentoring. However, mentoring done during the leave period will be added on to the last two years' average.

## V. Service

### a. Principles:

- i. **Expectations:** All faculty members are expected to contribute to the service needs of the department, university and profession as a matter of course, including items not specifically addressed in this process.
  - ii. **Service obligation:** There is a service obligation of 1 point for tenured faculty. This amount is subtracted from their service points. This embodies the principle that more of the service burden should be borne by tenured faculty. Doing so also raises the marginal benefit for each additional service point.
  - iii. **Factors:** This merit evaluation serves to compensate major activities taking into account the following factors: the relationship of the program to the academic objectives and interests of the Department; the quantity of work involved and the availability of support staff; and the extent to which external financial compensation is provided. The closer the program is related to the academic objectives and interests of the Department, the more the work load falls on the individual in question, and the less he or she receives in external financial compensation, the greater the weight attached to this activity will be.
- b. **External compensation:** In order to be considered for points for non-departmental service, faculty must specify if and how the position was compensated; failure to do so will be an indication that the individual does not wish this service to be included in service points.
  - c. **Chair Compensation:** The chair will receive from the pool a service increase equal to the greater of \$2500 or the percentage increase of the merit pool increase given to the department by the Provost. The Chair will not receive any additional service points from the department.
  - d. **Departmental service** will be evaluated on the basis of the following guidelines (with exceptions as deemed appropriate by the P & B committee):

Director of Undergraduate Studies

- A total of \$6,000 compensation and 1.5 points

Deputy Director of Undergraduate Studies (1.25)  
Planning and Budget Committee (Chair 2.5, member 1.25)  
Admissions and Fellowships Committee (Chair 2.5, member 1.25)  
Field Coordinator (AP, CP, IR, PT) (1.5)

CDATS 1.00

PECO Director 1.00

Search Committee, tenure track position (Chair 0.75; member 0.37)

Search Committee, other (Chair 0 to 0.25; member 0 to 0.15)

Departmental scribe (0.5)

Lepgold Prize Committee (Chair 0.12; member 0.06)

Tenure Committee Chair (promotion to Associate 0.5; to Full 0.37)

Other Major Departmental Ad Hoc Committees (0-1)

- e. **University service** outside the Department will be evaluated on the basis of the following scale:

Rank and Tenure Committee (2)

Faculty Senate Office (0-1; typically 0.25)

Administration of Academic Program (0-2)

Other Activities (Deans' committees, College Executive Council, SFS Executive Council, etc.) (0-1)

- f. **Scholarly and professional service** outside the University will be recognized to a maximum of 1.5 points in any given year. Activities will be evaluated on the basis of the following scale:

Editorial boards of professional journals (0-.5) with **CAP of 0.5**

Professional association committees (0-.5) with **CAP of 0.5**

Community service-professional (0-.5) with **CAP of 0.5**

- g. **Joint faculty** will receive points for ordinary service performed for the other unit (such as search committees, executive committees and so forth) subject to a cap of the number of points of service performed for the Government Department. Major service work for other units (including Center Directorships) are typically compensated directly by the other unit; faculty should note when this is not the case and the committee should consider the situation appropriately.

- h. **Service reports:** Chairs of departmental committees should submit reports to the department chair identifying any discrepancies in workloads carried by individual members of committees. These variations in workload should be taken into account when points are awarded for service on committees.

- i. **Leave Policy:** Those on leave of absence or sabbatical during the year under review will be evaluated in service as follows:

i. In the first year, they will receive the average of their last two years service evaluation.

ii. Those on leave for one term will receive the points for the term in which they are not on leave plus one-half the average of their last two years evaluation.

iii. Faculty members who have been on leave for two years shall receive the minimum of 75% the average of previous two years' points and the median of the department.

## VI. Committee Proposals (February 2009)

- a. **Awards:** Add points from 0 to 1.0 for book and paper awards that are received after a book or article has already been awarded points in the previous year. This is to provide extra points for highly meritorious scholarship.
- b. **More detailed guidance** In order that departmental norms reflect disciplinary norms, the Committee and Department should be given more explicit guidelines. The Committee would have the ability to deviate as appropriate, but having more direct guidelines would lessen possible subjectivity and would make for an efficient and predictable process. Here is a (very) rough draft of what this would look like (with specific presses and journals added to guidance):
  - i. **Books**
    1. Major academic presses: 9 to 10 points
      - a. Cambridge, Oxford, Princeton, Chicago, Cornell, MIT, Michigan, Harvard
    2. Award-winning books – up to 1 additional point
    3. Other academic presses (peer reviewed press): 6 to 8 points.
    4. Commercial press: 0 to 5 points
  - ii. **Articles**
    1. Top-tier journals: 3.5 to 4.0 points
      - a. APSR, IO, AJPS, JOP, World Politics
    2. Well-regarded specialty journals: 2 to 3 points
      - a. For example: Comparative Politics (move up?), International Security (move up?), CPS, ISQ, LSQ, Political Theory,
    3. Third-tier (peer-reviewed, but less well-known): 0.5 to 2 points
    4. Non-academic: 0 to 0.5 points
  - iii. **Book chapters**
    1. Peer-reviewed in major university press: 0.5 to 1.2 points
    2. Peer-reviewed in second-tier academic press: 0.4 to 0.75 points
    3. Non-peer reviewed academic press: 0.2 to 0.5
    4. Commercial press or textbook: 0.05 to 0.3
  - iv. **Conference papers**
    1. Major conference: APSA, ISA, Midwest: 0 to 0.20
    2. Minor conference: all others 0 to 0.1
    3. Cap of 0.4 for all conference papers