

Social Sciences Unit Plan Fall 2015

Introduction and Division Philosophy

We are a diverse division, with many different disciplines and approaches to teaching, learning and scholarship. Although all our disciplines focus on the study of human behavior, we depart from each other in some important ways. For example, our disciplines range from a specific career path in counseling, such as Human Services, to more academically oriented social scientific disciplines, with some career applications, like Communication and Sociology, to a discipline that focuses on individual behavior and merges with the Biological Sciences at many points, like Psychology. Several of these disciplines overlap with several of these orientations.

Within our diverse division, however, we do share some common values and beliefs regarding our academic responsibilities. We value knowledge, learning, thinking, and curiosity. To these ends, our teaching and our scholarship reflect these shared values. As we teach, our common goals include the analysis, application, integration, synthesis and critical evaluation of knowledge about human behavior. We do this with a critical eye toward the particular body of knowledge and epistemology reflective of our various disciplinary backgrounds. For these reasons, we demand rigor and currency in our teaching; however, we also acknowledge a diversity of pedagogies through which a faculty member may demonstrate excellence in teaching, and we entrust our faculty to select the most appropriate teaching methods for each class they teach. Consistent with Policies and Procedures, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to seek to identify and pursue those teaching methods best suited to each situation. Such methods may include collaborative teaching, apprentice/mentor roles, seminars/discussions, traditional lecture models, or performance learning opportunities.

Advising is another central educational mission of Millikin University as (1) a collaborative system shared by students, faculty, administration, and staff attuned to departmental needs for professional development, and (2) an ongoing process of exploration, discovery, reflection, and growth. As such, advising grounds a Millikin education by facilitating and integrating reasoned choices that promote the student's personal and professional growth within a diverse and global community.

The diversity within our division is perhaps more evident with respect to scholarship. We acknowledge diverse professional, pedagogical, theoretical and empirical dimensions in our engagement with scholarship. We represent and practice diverse approaches to the study of human behavior, including both quantitative and qualitative forms of investigation, and studies that focus both on the contemporary world as well as those that have a longer-term historical vision. Regardless of these differences, we affirm a central tenet of the scientific method: for something to be known it must be made public and be held up to scrutiny by a group of our intellectual peers. That is not to say that all our scholarship is scientific. However, the ultimate criterion, and the end point of our scholarship, is public sharing of information through peer reviewed channels, such as exemplified in the rubric below. We acknowledge that the work, which ultimately results in a peer-reviewed product, is scholarship. Not all projects will result in publication, however, for one to be competent as a scholar, some work must be acknowledged by peers and therefore published.

The Division accepts the definition of “peer” as defined in *Policies and Procedures: Faculty* in Section 1.2.3.2. and uses the criteria that serve as the common basis on which scholarship/artistic achievement will be judged. According to Policies & Procedures, one’s peers are defined as “persons of at least equal expertise.” Our disciplines are too diverse to come to some local-regional-national distinction. In some disciplines the major professional associations ARE the regional ones. In others, they are not. While peer review typically involves external evaluation (e.g. peer reviewed academic journals), we define peer review as any evaluation by a competent evaluator (a “person of at least equal expertise”), who deems the scholarship as an important contribution to the discipline. As such, peer review may not necessarily involve outside or external review for every form of scholarship we engage in.

Because diversity is valued and promoted at Millikin, scholarship can take many forms, such as research, professional service, consulting, and other creative projects. Our scholarship sometimes relates to our teaching obligations, such as attending conferences, seminars, or trainings on teaching pedagogy, or collaborative research with students ending in conference presentations or publication.

We expect that evaluators of our accomplishments in teaching, scholarship and service will rank us using the standards set forth in this unit plan, consistent with Policies & Procedures, and according to the accepted ranking system (extraordinary, excellent, competent, marginal) in a fair and unbiased manner, and with some deference to experts in the field, particularly when that field lies outside the expertise of the evaluator herself.

Given the diversity of our disciplines, the following rubric is a format common throughout many of our disciplines, and it reflects our values in teaching, scholarship and service.

UNIT PLAN SOCIAL SCIENCES DIVISION

Adopted: Spring 2001, Revised: Fall 2006, Fall 2009, Fall 2015

EXTRAORDINARY RANKING	
Teaching	<p>THE BEST AMONG US:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • very high teaching evaluation numbers on communication and course organization. • evidence of very high level of knowledge, academic rigor, and attention to individual needs of students. • extremely well written, descriptive and reflective teaching philosophy. • clear evidence of extraordinary learning outcomes. • formal recognition of teaching. • advising activities including, but not limited to, mentoring new faculty advisors on the advising system, contributing to the on-going professional development of other faculty advisors, advising for a specialized program, such as a pre-professional area, serving as research advisor or for expert assistance by students who choose a research project, advising one or more JMS research project(s). <p>These examples of evidence are not intended to be hierarchically listed nor exhaustive: teaching philosophy, grades, SIR scores, syllabi, handouts, tests, written comments from students, awards, outside reviewers' comments, sample outcomes from students, reflective narrative on teaching.</p>
Scholarship or Artistic Achievement	<p>OUTSTANDING:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sustained pattern of peer reviewed work. • evidence that peers from outside the university acknowledge this body of work to be outstanding. • recognition of extraordinary stature within the field over time. For example: documentation or letter from peers, a keynote address at the APA, a Top Paper in Communication journal. <p>Examples of peer reviewed work include: publication in a peer-reviewed journal (print or electronic), conference presentations, author of book, editor of book, author of book chapter, published book review, author of grant.</p>
University Service	<p>MAJOR CONTRIBUTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pattern of leadership on major committees or councils. • contributions that have had a significant impact on the university,

	<p>college and/or department.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • documented quality of work resulting from faculty member’s leadership. <p>These examples of evidence are not intended to be hierarchically listed nor exhaustive. Departmental service: Chair, committee/council chair or member, or special assignment. College or University service: Committee chair or member, program director, division chair, special assignment.</p>
<p>Service to the Profession</p>	<p>MAJOR CONTRIBUTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contributions over time that have had a significant impact on the profession. • documented quality of work resulting from faculty member’s service. <p>These examples of evidence are not intended to be hierarchically listed nor exhaustive: Offices in professional associations, book reviews for publishers, session organizer or planner, chair, or discussant (moderator or responder) at a professional meeting, consultant to professional organization, program reviewer, peer reviewer for publication or conference presentation, or other supportive activities for the profession.</p>
<p>Professional Service to the Community</p>	<p>MAJOR CONTRIBUTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contributions over time that have had a significant impact on the community. • documented quality of work resulting from faculty member’s service. <p>These examples of evidence are not intended to be hierarchically listed nor exhaustive; all examples must be related to professional expertise: Radio/TV interviews, board positions, consultant or advisor to community organization, research or reports for community organizations.</p>

EXCELLENT RANKING	
Teaching	<p>A MODEL TO EMULATE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sustained teaching evaluation numbers at the division or university means on communication and course organization. • evidence of high level of knowledge, academic rigor, and attention to individual needs of students. • well written, descriptive and reflective teaching philosophy. • evidence of excellent learning outcomes. • advising activities including, but not limited to, orienting and mentoring new students with respect to the university experience, orienting and mentoring students from outside the major with respect to the major experience, or serving as minor advisor for one or more student(s). <p>These examples of evidence are not intended to be hierarchically listed nor exhaustive: teaching philosophy, grades, SIR scores, syllabi, handouts, tests, written comments from students, awards, outside reviewers' comments, sample outcomes from students, reflective narrative on teaching.</p>
Scholarship or Artistic Achievement	<p>STRONG CONTRIBUTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evidence that peers outside the university have found the body of work to be strong and a significant contribution to the field. For example: there needs to be 2 or more examples of peer-reviewed material. The material needs to show an array of work over time, and be acknowledged as “strong and significant” by peers. <p>Examples of peer reviewed work include: publication in a peer-reviewed journal (print or electronic), conference presentations, author of book, editor of book, author of book chapter, published book review, author of grant.</p>
University Service	<p>BEYOND EXPECTED OF ALL FACULTY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • leadership role. • special distinction. • special contribution. <p>These examples of evidence are not intended to be hierarchically listed nor exhaustive. Departmental service: Chair, committee chair or member, lab supervisor or special assignment. College or University service: Committee chair or member, program director, division chair, special assignment.</p>

<p>Service to the Profession</p>	<p>STRONG CONTRIBUTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contributions that have been strong, but have had a less significant impact on the profession. <p>These examples of evidence are not intended to be hierarchically listed nor exhaustive: Offices in professional associations, book reviews for publishers, session organizer or planner, chair, or discussant (moderator or responder) at a professional meeting, consultant to professional organization, program reviewer, peer reviewer for publication or conference presentation, or other supportive activities for the profession.</p>
<p>Professional Service to the Community</p>	<p>STRONG CONTRIBUTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contributions that have been strong, but have had a less significant impact on the community. <p>These examples of evidence are not intended to be hierarchically listed nor exhaustive; all examples must be related to professional expertise: Radio/TV interviews, board positions, consultant or advisor to community organization, research or reports for community organizations.</p>

COMPETENT RANKING	
Teaching	<p>COMPETENT TEACHER:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • teaching evaluation numbers below the division or university means, but within the confidence intervals, on communication and course organization. • some evidence of knowledge, academic rigor, and attention to individual needs of students. • evidence of adequate learning outcomes. • advising activities including but not limited to reviewing advisees' plans of study at least once a semester, reviewing advisees' CAPP evaluation at least once a year, understanding how to use MU Online, CAPP, electronic portfolios, and or other online resources used by a particular program or department, explaining requirements for the major, areas of emphasis or concentration, the minor, university studies, and the college, attending departmental research meetings and seminars when the teaching schedule permits, and being available for student conferences during the pre-registration period each semester. <p>These examples of evidence are not intended to be hierarchically listed nor exhaustive: teaching philosophy, grades, SIR scores, syllabi, handouts, tests, written comments from students, awards, outside reviewers' comments, sample outcomes from students, reflective narrative on teaching.</p>
Scholarship or Artistic Achievement	<p>COMPETENCE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evidence that peers outside the university have found the body of work to be acceptable. For example: there should be at least one of the examples listed below or similar peer-reviewed work. <p>Examples of peer reviewed work include: publication in a peer-reviewed journal (print or electronic), conference presentations, author of book, editor of book, author of book chapter, published book review, author of grant.</p>
University Service	<p>FAIR SHARE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contribution expected of all faculty. • conscientious service to university, division and/or department.
Service to the Profession	<p>COMPETENT CONTRIBUTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contributions to the profession that have been competent. <p>These examples of evidence are not intended to be hierarchically listed nor exhaustive: Offices in professional associations, book reviews for publishers, session organizer or planner, chair, or discussant (moderator or</p>

	<p>responder) at a professional meeting, consultant to professional organization, program reviewer, peer reviewer for publication or conference presentation, or other supportive activities for the profession.</p>
<p>Professional Service to the Community</p>	<p>COMPETENT CONTRIBUTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contributions to the community that have been competent. <p>These examples of evidence are not intended to be hierarchically listed nor exhaustive; all examples must be related to professional expertise: Radio/TV interviews, board positions, consultant or advisor to community organization, research or reports for community organizations.</p>

MARGINAL RANKING	
Teaching	<p>MARGINAL TEACHER:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • teaching evaluation numbers below the division or university means, or infrequently within the confidence intervals on communication and course organization. • minimal evidence of knowledge, academic rigor, and attention to individual needs of students. • minimal evidence of adequate learning outcomes. • minimal evidence of advising knowledge about degree options, plans of study, or resource contact persons. <p>These examples of evidence are not intended to be hierarchically listed nor exhaustive: teaching philosophy, grades, SIR scores, syllabi, handouts, tests, written comments from students, awards, outside reviewers' comments, sample outcomes from students, reflective narrative on teaching.</p>
Scholarship or Artistic Achievement	<p>MARGINAL COMPETENCE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • little evidence that peers outside the university have found the body of work to be acceptable. For example: a publication or two, but not peer-reviewed. • Evidence of research in preparation for publication. <p>Examples of peer reviewed work include: publication in a peer-reviewed journal (print or electronic), conference presentations, author of book, editor of book, author of book chapter, published book review, author of grant.</p>
University Service	<p>LESS THAN EXPECTED:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contribution less than that expected of all faculty, • minimal service to university, division and/or department. <p>These examples of evidence are not intended to be hierarchically listed nor exhaustive. Departmental service: Chair, committee chair or member, lab supervisor or special assignment. College or University service: Committee chair or member, program director, division chair, special assignment.</p>
Service to the Profession	<p>LESS THAN EXPECTED:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • less than expected contributions to the profession. <p>These examples of evidence are not intended to be hierarchically listed nor exhaustive: Offices in professional associations, book reviews for publishers, session organizer or planner, chair, or discussant (moderator or</p>

	<p>responder) at a professional meeting, consultant to professional organization, program reviewer, peer reviewer for publication or conference presentation, or other supportive activities for the profession.</p>
<p>Professional Service to the Community</p>	<p>LESS THAN EXPECTED:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • less than expected contributions to the community. <p>These examples of evidence are not intended to be hierarchically listed nor exhaustive; all examples must be related to professional expertise: Radio/TV interviews, board positions, consultant or advisor to community organization, research or reports for community organizations.</p>

UNSATISFACTORY RANKING	
Teaching	<p>UNSATISFACTORY TEACHING:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • teaching evaluation numbers consistently below the division or university means and confidence intervals on communication and course organization. • evidence of unsatisfactory knowledge, academic rigor, and attention to individual needs of students. • evidence of inadequate learning outcomes. • incorrect or misleading advising information in terms of degree options, plans of study, or resource contact persons, failure to keep appointments, excessively slow to respond to student inquiries.
Scholarship or Artistic Achievement	<p>UNSATISFACTORY SCHOLARSHIP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence that peers outside the university have found the body of work to be acceptable.
University Service	<p>UNSATISFACTORY SERVICE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contribution considerably less than that expected of all faculty.
Service to the Profession	<p>UNSATISFACTORY SERVICE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contribution considerably less than that expected of all faculty.
Professional Service to the Community	<p>UNSATISFACTORY SERVICE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contribution considerably less than that expected of all faculty.