

BYLAWS
OF THE DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

Faculty Governance

Last Revised: 10/07/2010 (reflecting amendments adopted on 09/24/2010)

A. Department Faculty

1. The Departmental faculty shall consist of all Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors and full-time Instructors with primary academic appointments in the department.
2. Unless otherwise indicated, the right to vote on questions specified in these by-laws shall extend to all Department faculty but not to visiting, adjunct, temporary, or part-time appointees, research faculty or professional staff members.
3. Within the limits established by the University faculty, the Departmental faculty shall determine the educational policies of the department.
4. Policies may be established by the Department faculty in conformity with these Bylaws and a permanent written file of these policies shall be maintained and kept available in the Department office.

B. Department Chair

1. The Chair is responsible for the general administration of departmental affairs, including but not limited to:
 - a. Recommendations on faculty salary increases and of salaries for newly appointed faculty members;
 - b. Appointments to internal administrative positions, including Vice-Chair, program directors, recruitment chairs, etc.
 - c. Assignment of teaching schedules for all faculty members, taking into account that the Department's policy regarding the teaching load of untenured faculty is to limit the number of new course preparations they will be asked to teach to no more than 4 in their first two years (typically 2 in the first year and 1 or 2 in the second), and no more than 6, total, until tenured.
 - d. Recommendations on leaves without pay and sabbatical leaves;

e. Allocation of departmental funds for travel, equipment, supplies, temporary service expenses: and the assignment of office space and staff services;

f. Making appointments to Departmental Committees, where the Chair shall seek broad representation of the interests and experience of the faculty, consistent with the purpose for which the Committees are established.

2. The Chair has final responsibility for personnel evaluation, salary recommendations, and for preparation and transmittal of Departmental recommendations on promotion and tenure.

3. The Chair will make available to the Department on an annual basis or at appropriate times each year, information regarding the Department's operations and resource allocations.

C. Vice-Chair

1. The Department Chair will appoint the Vice-Chair from the ranks of tenured full-time faculty.

2. The duties of the Vice-Chair shall include representation of the Department, in the absence of the Chair, and such duties as are delegated by the Chair consistent with that office's responsibilities as set forth in the *Faculty Manual* and paragraph I:B above. In no case will the office of Vice-Chair entitle its incumbent to participation in decisions, such as tenure, promotion, or faculty evaluation, that the incumbent's rank would not otherwise permit.

D. Departmental Faculty Meeting

1. In addition to all voting members of the department, all other persons holding academic appointments in the department are invited to attend faculty meetings.

2. Representatives of graduate students and undergraduate students shall be invited to attend (in an advisory, nonvoting role) faculty meetings.

3. Regular meetings shall be held throughout the academic year on dates selected by the Chair. Special meetings may be held at the initiative of the Chair or at the written request of five voting members of the Faculty. Special meetings will be held within one week after being called. An agenda should be circulated at least one day in advance of the meeting. For both regular and special meetings, the parliamentary authority will be the current edition of Robert's Rules of Order.

E. Department Committees

1. Departmental Advisory Committee: There shall be a Departmental Advisory Committee consisting of the Chair, the graduate director, the undergraduate director, the MPA director, and four elected members.

a. Elected members will serve for two years and normally are not eligible for immediate re-election. The Chair will request nominations from the department before the first Fall faculty meeting and a list of all those nominated will be distributed with the meeting agenda. Elections, conducted by secret ballot, using approval voting, will be conducted promptly after the list of nominees has been distributed.

b. The Advisory Committee will meet regularly and will advise the Chair on all aspects of departmental administration, governance and policy (excluding questions of personnel evaluation, tenure, and promotion).

2. Program Committees

The Chair shall appoint program committees in consultation with the respective Program Directors. The Program Director shall serve as chair of the committee. Each program committee shall be composed of at least two faculty members, with the exception of coordinating committees involving other institutions. At least one student, selected annually by the appropriate student organization, shall serve as a member of each committee for consideration of all matters except funding and personnel. These committees will administer their respective programs. They shall, when needed, make recommendations to the Chair and the departmental faculty. The appointed members other than the chair shall serve no more than three years and may not be appointed to a succeeding term.

3. The Department chair's recommendations for an appointment to an endowed chair will be made after a consultation with a departmental committee composed of the current holders of endowed chairs.

II. Appointment of Tenure Track Faculty

A. Position Description

1. Prior to receiving administrative approval to initiate a faculty search, the Chair shall call a meeting of the faculty to discuss departmental needs regarding positions (excluding directed position hires). The Chair shall then draft a preliminary position description that shall be submitted to the Advisory Committee for approval. The final wording of the position description shall be determined by the Chair in consultation with the Advisory Committee.

B. Recruitment Committee

1. The Department Chair will appoint a Search Committee Chair. In consultation with the Committee Chair, a search committee consisting of at least four members will be selected.

Normally in making these appointments the Department Chair will include members from all ranks.

2. At the discretion of each Search Committee, at least one graduate student should be selected to serve as a non-voting member.

C. Recruitment Procedures

1. Soliciting Applications: The Committee will advertise the position in appropriate professional outlets and will abide by all relevant University EEO and Affirmative Action requirements.

1.2. Reviewing Files:

a. After a reasonable opportunity for broad participation, the Search Committee will identify a long list. All applicant files are to be made readily available for faculty review, and faculty input through comment sheets and memoranda to the Search Committee will be strongly encouraged.

b. Each Search Committee will establish guidelines for graduate student review of applicant files. Graduate student participation is to be encouraged.

3. Interviews: The Committee normally will select three candidates for interviews and report its choices. Interviews will be scheduled by the Search Committee Chair in consultation with the Department Chair. Dates of visits will be announced as soon as possible and not less than two working days before the arrival of the candidate. Interviews will typically include a formal presentation, individual meetings with interested faculty and administrators, opportunities for faculty to meet the candidates informally, and an opportunity for graduate students to meet the candidates informally.

D. Selection

1. Once interviews have been completed, the Committee Chair will schedule a special faculty meeting to promote discussion of the candidates. Graduate student input will be solicited by the Committee Chair and presented during this meeting.

2. Faculty votes will be solicited immediately after the meeting through the use of sealed paper ballots to be opened by the Committee. In addition to an acceptable/unacceptable vote on each candidate, the ballots shall include a rank order of candidates and a description of the voter's contact with the candidates. The Department shall not recommend any candidate who does not received a majority of acceptable votes.

3. When relevant, a separate vote will be taken on tenure and/or rank, in a manner consistent with the *Faculty Manual* and Departmental Tenure and Promotion requirements.

4. The Committee will report the vote and its recommendation to the Department Chair, who will expeditiously and fully inform the faculty prior to forwarding his/her recommendation to the Dean.

5. Should the preferred candidate(s) decline the job offer, any further action should be consistent with the vote of the GINT faculty and the spirit of these search procedures.

III. Hire and Renewal of Non-Tenure Track Faculty

A. Non-tenure track faculty must be considered as exceptional appointments and should be considered on a case-by-case basis with the following criteria in mind:

1. These faculty should bring some special qualifications or expertise that cannot be filled from within the department by faculty or advanced graduate students.

2. It is expected that they will have the necessary academic or professional qualifications for the courses they are giving.

B. Appointment

1. The initial appointment may be made on the basis of the recommendation of the Department Chair after consultation with the Advisory Committee. A file on the proposed appointment should be available for all faculty to inspect in the Chair's office. Faculty should have the opportunity to inform the Department Advisory Committee of their concerns in advance of such appointments.

2. An evaluation of adjunct instructors being considered for reappointment should include peer reviews, student evaluations, resumes or vitae, and other information; and this material should be made available for faculty discussion and recommendation. The teaching of newly appointed adjunct instructors must be peer reviewed, and continuing adjuncts should be peer reviewed on a regular basis.

3. The terms of all appointments/reappointments shall be for no more than one year.

IV. Advisory Evaluation of Faculty

A. Committee Structure

1. Four tenured faculty members will be elected, by approval voting, to serve as an Advisory Evaluation Committee to advise the Chair in the annual evaluation of the faculty. Faculty will be nominated and the election held no later than one month before the due date for annual evaluation reports from individual faculty.

2. Members will serve on this committee for two years, with no member serving for more than three years in a six-year period.

3. Two members will be elected in odd years and two members will be elected in even years.

B. Advisory Evaluation of Faculty

1. The Evaluation Committee will select a Chair.

2. The Committee will evaluate the faculty in the three areas of Teaching, Research and Scholarship, and Service. Faculty will be evaluated within academic ranks. The following scale will be applied to each area and to an overall assessment of each person reviewed: (5. Outstanding; 4. Very Good; 3. Good; 2. Satisfactory; 1. Unsatisfactory) .

3a. In evaluating faculty in the area of Research and Scholarship, the Committee will give greatest weight to work of original scholarship published by leading academic and university presses, to refereed articles in leading journals, and to research proposals funded by external funding agencies. Somewhat less weight will be given to monographs reporting original research published by other reputable presses, especially other university presses, and to refereed articles in other academic or scholarly journals. Still less weight will be given to edited volumes, chapters in edited volumes, review essays, first edition textbooks, and non-funded research proposals submitted for external review. The least weight will be given to non-refereed journal publications, papers presented at professional conferences, and public service research reports. Second and subsequent editions of textbooks, book reviews, encyclopedia entries, and publications in the popular press will receive no weight toward the Committee's evaluation of a faculty member's research, although these works should ordinarily be counted as contributions toward Teaching and/or Service. Also, in evaluating research, single authorship should, generally, be given greater weight than co-authorship.

3b. In evaluating faculty in the area of Teaching, the Committee will give greatest weight to effectiveness as a teacher, particularly as evidenced by teaching awards, peer and student evaluations, and by the successful direction of dissertations, theses, and other significant forms of mentoring at the graduate and undergraduate levels. Considerable but lesser weight will be given to the quality of syllabi and other course materials, teaching grants, the development and implementation of innovative teaching methods and new courses, published monographs and articles focused on pedagogy, and publications of newly revised textbooks. Finally, other factors to be given somewhat less weight in the evaluation of teaching will include active service on dissertation and thesis committees, the teaching of new course preps, participation in teaching workshops, student advising, and letters from students and administrators describing one's teaching effectiveness or impact.

3c. In evaluating faculty in the area of Service, the Committee will grade performance primarily in terms of the breadth and depth of service, while being sensitive to rank. Breadth refers to participation in the categories of professional, departmental, college, university, community, and public service, activities; depth refers to the quality and

quantity of activity within these categories. The greater the breadth, and the greater the depth, the higher the grade.

4. The Committee shall meet to discuss the provisional evaluations of the faculty; the Department Chair should be present at these meetings.
5. The Committee members shall then provide to the Department Chair a written explanation of their final evaluations of each faculty member. The Department Chair will discuss the evaluations with those evaluated and provide to them a copy of the advisory evaluations upon request.
6. The Department Chair will report the final evaluations to the Committee.

C. Third-Year Review

1. During the Spring semester of the third year of service in a tenure track position, individuals will be formally reviewed to assess progress toward tenure and to determine whether retention is warranted. Earlier, in the Fall of the third year, the Chair will advise such individuals to assemble a personal file for faculty review as per College regulations, documenting their progress toward tenure. The Chair will also appoint a review Committee for each individual, and each Committee will prepare an evaluation of each individual's performance for faculty review.
2. All tenured faculty members of the Department will be responsible for reviewing the files assembled by the individual and the Committee, and for attending a meeting, held during the Spring semester, at which the Committee will present its written evaluation of the individual's record. The focus of discussion will be the candidate's standing and progress toward meeting the Department's criteria for tenure, and possible recommendations for improvement.
3. Subsequent to that meeting, all tenured faculty will vote, recommending that the candidate be retained or not retained. Voting faculty will be expected to address in writing, as part of the ballot or as an attachment to it, the individual's progress toward meeting the Department's tenure criteria, and possible suggestions for improvement. All untenured faculty will also be encouraged to examine the personal and Committee files, and express in writing to the Chair their views on the individual's progress.
4. Drawing on the individual's personal file, the Committee's report, and the votes and recommendations of the tenured faculty, the Department Chair and the Dean will together prepare a written letter of evaluation of the candidate. The co-authored letter will include a decision as to retention and may include suggestions for improvement.
5. A copy of the Committee's report will be provided to the candidate when the candidate receives the letter from the Chair and Dean. The candidate may also review copies of individual assessments included with the votes.

6. All evaluations and any personal responses shall become a part of the person's permanent personnel file.

V. Faculty Promotion and Tenure

(Adopted by tenured members of the Political Science (GINT) Department on December 16 and 19, 1994; adjustments approved by tenured faculty April 11, 1995, August 23, 1995, January 14, 1997, and April 29, 1997; amended on April 27, 2001, April 19, 2002, August 26, 2011, and May 27, 2013. This version approved by the University Committee on Tenure and Promotion on October 16, 2013.)

A. Promotion and Tenure Criteria

1. General

a. These promotion and tenure criteria are adopted by the tenured faculty of the Department of Political Science to fit its particular needs, recognizing the scholarly diversity of this Department. The criteria are not intended to prescribe a uniform pattern of accomplishments that must be achieved by all candidates for tenure or promotion. Rather, they identify ways of evaluating accomplishments in the three areas of research/scholarship, teaching, and service, while permitting the flexibility necessary to accommodate individual talents and interests within the general guidelines set by the College and the University in the Faculty Manual. The October 5, 2012 revision of the Faculty Manual was in effect at the time of the latest revision of these criteria. In the remainder of this document, it is understood that "Outstanding" implies a higher standard than "Excellent" and "Excellent" implies a higher standard than "Good."

Candidates being considered for their first promotion may use either the criteria in place when they were hired or the criteria in place when they are being considered; candidates being considered for their second promotion must use the criteria in effect at that time.

2. Promotion Eligibility.

a. Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor -- The faculty member will normally hold the earned doctor's degree and will have a record of scholarly achievement beyond the doctoral dissertation and an evident capacity for significant contribution to his/her field. If hired from another institution in which the candidate held a tenure-track position as an Assistant Professor, there is no set minimum time of service at USC before promotion to associate professor can be considered. The candidate's total record will be considered for promotion. An Excellent level of performance must be demonstrated in the category of research/scholarship. A Good level of performance in the

categories of teaching and service are required. The Department recognizes that in certain sub-fields, a stronger contribution in the service component may be considered.

i. Research/Scholarship – Excellent performance in this area is demonstrated by meeting three criteria. First, the candidate must demonstrate the existence of a sustained program of research oriented to or guided by a significant set of theoretical and substantive issues in his or her field(s) of specialization. In this respect, a written statement by the candidate describing the research program, including an account of how it arose and has evolved and how it has been productive and can be expected to be so into the future, must be included in the file. A rating of Excellent requires, second, that the candidate's total scholarly record be measured by the kind of evidence outlined in Appendix A and including especially the existence of high quality externally-reviewed publications. Finally, Excellence requires that the candidate demonstrate progress toward developing a national and/or international reputation in his or her field(s) of specialization. Further detail on the evaluation of research performance is described in Appendix A.

ii. Teaching – A Good level of performance in this area is demonstrated by meeting three criteria. First, the candidate's overall teaching record must be deemed to have achieved a rating of Good, taking into account a multiplicity of relevant evidence as described in Appendix B. Second, the candidate must demonstrate that he or she is committed to teaching by including in the file a written statement describing his or her teaching philosophy and practice, and how he or she has endeavored to improve that practice over time. Finally, the candidate will, ordinarily, have a record establishing that he or she has offered a range of courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels, and has offered service/core courses within the Department; significant deviations from any of these ordinary requirements must be addressed and justified in the candidate's written statement describing his or her teaching philosophy and practice. Further detail on the evaluation of teaching performance is described in Appendix B.

iii. Service -- The candidate will have established a Good record of service by demonstrating the ability and willingness to engage in service activities within the Department, the wider University, and for professional organizations. The quality of a candidate's service performance will be an important factor in the evaluation of the candidate's service contribution. Recognition will be accorded for contributions to the community, the state, or the nation, but only if they are broadly related to teaching and research. Evidence relevant to the assessment of quality is described in Appendix C.

b. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor -- The faculty member will normally hold the earned doctor's degree. The candidate's entire professional career will be assessed, but emphasis will be placed on development while serving in the rank of Associate Professor. If hired from another institution in which the candidate held a tenure-track or tenure position as an Associate Professor, there is no minimum time of service at USC before promotion to Professor can be considered. The candidate will have

made significant contributions to his or her field. An Outstanding level of performance must be demonstrated in the category of research/scholarship; an Excellent level of performance in teaching and a Good level of performance in service are also required. The Department recognizes that in certain sub-fields, a stronger contribution in the service component may be considered.

i. Research/Scholarship -- Outstanding performance in this area is demonstrated by meeting three criteria. First, the candidate must demonstrate the existence of a sustained program of research oriented to or guided by a significant set of theoretical and substantive issues in his or her field(s) of specialization. In this respect, a written statement by the candidate describing the research program, including an account of how it arose and has evolved and how it has been productive and can be expected to be so into the future, must be included in the file. A rating of Outstanding requires, second, that the candidate's total scholarly record be measured by the kind of evidence outlined in Appendix A and including especially the existence of high quality externally-reviewed publications. Finally, being Outstanding requires that the candidate has achieved a national and/or international reputation in his or her field(s) of specialization.

ii. Teaching – An Excellent level of performance in this area is demonstrated by meeting three criteria. First, the candidate's overall teaching record must be deemed Excellent, taking into account a multiplicity of relevant evidence as described in Appendix B. Second, the candidate must demonstrate that he or she is committed to teaching by including in the file a written statement describing his or her teaching philosophy and practice, and how he or she has endeavored to improve that practice over time. Finally, the candidate will, ordinarily, have a record establishing that he or she has offered a range of courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels, and has offered service/core courses within the Department; significant deviations from any of these ordinary requirements must be addressed and justified in the candidate's written statement describing his or her teaching philosophy and practice.

iii. Service -- The candidate will have established a record of Good service comparable to the average service record of the full professors of the Political Science Department -- the ability and willingness to engage in service activities within the Department, the wider University, and for professional organizations. The quality of a candidate's service performance will be an important factor in the evaluation of the candidate's service contribution. Recognition will be accorded for contributions to the community, the state, or the nation, but only if they are broadly related to teaching and research. Evidence relevant to the assessment of quality is described in Appendix C.

3. Tenure

The criteria for tenure at the rank of Associate Professor are the same as the criteria for promotion to Associate Professor. The criteria for tenure at the rank of Professor are the same as the criteria for promotion to Professor. Individuals hired at either the Associate

or Professor level from outside the University may be required to serve a probationary period before a decision on tenure is taken; the maximum probationary period for Associate Professor or Professor is six years, as stated in the Faculty Manual (revision December 13, 2011). During this period, the individual must demonstrate a record of continued performance at the level necessary for tenure as defined above.

4. Weight of Factors

In all decisions on tenure and promotion, the area of Research/Scholarship shall be given the most weight in the overall evaluation, the area of Teaching shall be weighted as second in importance, and the area of Service shall be weighted as third in importance.

B. Procedures on Tenure and Promotion

1. The Department Chair will notify all eligible candidates at the beginning of each academic year of the Tenure and Promotion Calendar for that academic year. Candidates approaching the end of their probationary period must be notified in the semester prior to department consideration for tenure and promotion. The Department Chair will discuss questions of eligibility with each candidate, as necessary and appropriate. The Department Chair shall also be responsible for calling meetings of the tenured faculty.

2. On all tenure and promotion nominations, every member of the Department, regardless of rank or tenure status is invited to submit recommendations to the Department Chair.

3. Candidates will be responsible for the preparation of their files for review and the submission of documentary evidence relating to departmental criteria. Files will be prepared by candidates in full accordance with requirements of the University Committee on Tenure and Promotion. The file will include a listing of the materials in the file, signed by the candidate. It will also include a copy of the Departmental Tenure & Promotion Criteria, signed by the candidate. Outside referees shall be chosen by the Department Chair in consultation with the tenured members of the Department. The candidate may identify in writing potential reviewers he/she prefers not be selected, and such opposition shall be considered by the tenured faculty of appropriate rank. At least six referees will be contacted and supplied with copies of the University and Department policies, the candidate's vita, and representative publications selected by the candidate. All letters received from referees will become a part of the candidate's file.

4. In consultation with the candidate, a select committee of five faculty members will be appointed by the Department Chair. The select committee shall assist the candidate in ensuring that his/her file is as complete as possible, summarize for the Committee-of-the-Whole, in writing, the contents of the file, and make a recommendation to the Committee-of-the-Whole, including a justification. The Department Chair shall not serve on the five-member select committee.

5. Members of the Committee-of-the-Whole are responsible for thoroughly examining the file of each candidate, including reading available publications, and will initial the file to indicate that this responsibility has been met.

6. The appropriate tenured faculty of the Department will meet as a Committee-of-the-Whole, and will select a Tenure and Promotion Committee Chair who will chair the meeting (normally the chair of the five-member select committee noted in point 4 above). The Committee-of-the-Whole will vote subsequently by secret ballot on those candidates for tenure and/or promotion. A favorable recommendation by the Department requires two-thirds majority of the valid votes cast by the eligible faculty. A valid vote is one that has been accompanied by a written justification. Abstentions must also be justified. All tenured faculty will receive ballots and are eligible to vote, whether on campus or not, or on leave. Proxy votes shall not be permitted. Only the total of positive and negative votes cast will be used in determining the required two-thirds vote, though abstentions shall also be recorded by the Department Chair. Note: The spouse/partner of a candidate is not eligible to participate, in any form, at any stage of the promotion/tenure process.

7. The tenured full Professors of the Department will vote by secret ballot on candidates for tenure at and/or promotion to the rank of Professor. Recommendation by the Department requires a two-thirds majority of the valid votes cast, not counting abstentions. All full Professors will receive ballots and are eligible to vote, whether on campus or not, or on leave. Proxy votes shall not be permitted. Abstentions must be recorded by the Department Chair.

8. All candidates at all levels will be notified by the Department Chair of the Department's recommendation in their cases and of the Department Chair's recommendation.

9. In the event of a negative decision the Department Chair will meet with the candidate to explain the basis for the recommendation. The candidate has the right to appeal the decision according to the guidelines in the Faculty Manual. Such appeal shall be reported by the Department Chair to the Committee-of-the-Whole.

10. The Department Chair shall not cast a vote along with the members of the Committee-of-the-Whole but shall make known his/her recommendation on the candidate in a letter to be made part of the candidate's file, and in the appropriate places on the University P/T forms. In this letter, the Department Chair shall provide as extensive a justification of his/her evaluation of the candidate as is feasible.

11. Members of the Department will be informed of the overall result of the vote, and the Department Chair's recommendation. Any candidate not recommended by the Committee-of-the-Whole will be identified to the Dean. Failure to recommend is without prejudice with respect to future consideration. The complete vita and supporting files of all candidates recommended for tenure and/or promotion will be forwarded to the Dean.

12. Faculty with Joint Appointments. The criteria for granting tenure or promotion to a jointly appointed faculty member shall be those of the primary unit. For faculty holding joint appointments, each secondary unit must be given an opportunity to propose outside evaluators and to comment on evaluators proposed by the primary unit. An evaluation must be solicited from at least one evaluator nominated or approved by each secondary unit.

If Political Science serves as the secondary unit for one or more faculty members with joint appointments, the views of all faculty eligible to participate in evaluation of the candidate will be solicited and provided for inclusion in the candidate's file, as a summary of faculty comments.

If Political Science serves as the primary unit for one or more faculty members with joint appointments, the secondary department or program will be asked to provide a list of appropriate outside evaluators at the same time that the Political Science faculty are consulted for names of outside evaluators. The chair or director of the outside unit will have the same access to the candidate's file as the five member Political Science committee. Members of the secondary unit at the appropriate rank will be invited to review the candidate's file and the committee report at the same time the file is made available to the Political Science faculty. The chair/director and eligible faculty of the secondary unit will be invited to submit formal input to the candidate's file (placed in the candidate's file at least five working days prior to deadline for the Political Science vote on the candidate).

Similar procedures, as appropriately modified, should also be followed in regard to the Third Year Review and the Post-Tenure Review of faculty with joint appointments.

In the event that Political Science and another unit agree on a joint appointment, Political Science should ask for a memorandum of understanding (MOU). The MOU should include (1) identification of the tenuring unit; (2) teaching responsibilities and expectations, including split of teaching load between the primary and secondary units; (3) formula and criteria for sharing indirect cost return (IDCR) among the units; and (4) service responsibility load and split between the units. The MOU should include signatures of the jointly appointed faculty member, the unit heads of the primary and secondary units, the deans of the colleges in the units reside, and the provost. The teaching load for a joint appointment should not be greater than for a faculty member of the same rank in the primary unit. The service load for a joint appointment should be

comparable to normal service load of a faculty member of the same rank in the primary unit.

VI. Faculty Post-Tenure Review

(Approved by the faculty in Political Science, 17 February 2013.)

A. General

These post-tenure review guidelines are adopted by the Department of Political Science (formerly Government and International Studies) to fit its particular needs within the framework established by the regulations on post tenure review established in the University Faculty Manual. If any question should arise between the procedures in this document and the regulations in the University Faculty Manual, those in the University Faculty Manual will take precedence.

B. Faculty Eligibility for Post-Tenure Review.

Each tenured faculty member, regardless of rank and including those in departmental administrative positions, shall be reviewed every six years unless, during the previous six-year period, the faculty member is reviewed and advanced to or retained in a higher position (e.g., dean, a chaired professorship, promotion to a higher professorial rank). However, post-tenure review will be waived for any faculty member who notifies the unit chair in writing prior to the next scheduled review, of plans for retirement within three years after the review would have been scheduled. Post-tenure review will be conducted by tenured faculty members of equal or higher rank.

C. The Post-Tenure Review Committee

For the review of faculty below the rank of full professor, the membership of the department Post-Tenure Review Committee (hereafter referred to as the Committee) will consist of all tenured full and associate professors in the department who have not received an unsatisfactory post-tenure evaluation within the past six years. For the review of faculty at the rank of full professor, the membership of the Committee will consist of all tenured full professors in the department who have not received an unsatisfactory post-tenure evaluation within the past six years. Faculty who are having post-tenure review conducted in a given year will be excluded from participation on the Committee during the year of their review. The chair of the department is eligible neither to vote nor serve on the Committee. The Chair of the Committee will be appointed by the department chair. Each year, the chair of the department will appoint a subcommittee (hereafter referred to as the Subcommittee) of at least three members from among the members of the Committee eligible to participate in Committee deliberations for the year. The Subcommittee will be charged with conducting an examination of the record of

achievement of each faculty member undergoing post-tenure review for the year and preparing a report on the candidates' qualifications to the full Committee. In any year in which the department does not have three tenured full professors and yet must constitute a post tenure review committee for a full professor, the unit will follow the general guidelines for tenure and promotion.

D. File Documentation.

The faculty member who is being reviewed will submit a post-tenure review file to the Subcommittee. After the Subcommittee evaluation is completed, the file will be available for inspection by all members of the Committee. While the faculty member being reviewed may include any documentation he/she believes to be pertinent, the faculty member must include at least the following material in the file. (Materials specified below as required that are contained in the annual evaluation files do not need to be provided in any separate format.)

1. Teaching

- a. A list of all courses taught in the previous six years, with enrollments for each course.
- b. A numerical summary of student evaluations for all courses taught in the past six years for which department policy required student evaluation.
- c. A copy of the peer teaching review conducted by the Subcommittee.

2. Scholarship

- a. A listing of all scholarly activities conducted during the previous six years, giving complete bibliographic information. The listing must indicate whether each entry was peer reviewed by external reviewers.
- b. One copy of each peer reviewed publication published in the past six years.
- c. Two letters from external reviewers that evaluate the candidate's research over the past six years may be required: see Procedures at E.2 below.

d. Details about any sabbatical leave awarded during the period under review, including the sabbatical application, the report on the use of the sabbatical leave, and any other discussion of the results of the leave.

3. Service

a. A listing of major service activities performed over the past 6 years.

4. Annual Evaluations

a. The annual report forms from the past six years.

b. A current vita.

c. A copy of all annual performance evaluations conducted by the chair for the past six years.

E. Procedures

1. The Chair of the Subcommittee will insure that the Subcommittee conducts a peer review of the candidate's teaching in a timely manner.

2. The Chair of the Subcommittee will secure two evaluations by external reviewers for candidates who, in the past six years, have not published at least two pieces of original, peer-reviewed research. Original, peer-reviewed research typically refers to books and articles in professional journals.

3. The Subcommittee will meet and discuss the performance of each candidate after each member of the Subcommittee has carefully reviewed the files of all candidates. At the conclusion of this discussion, the Subcommittee will prepare a written report explaining its evaluations. This report shall be available only to members of the Committee and other members of the university community participating in the post-tenure review of the candidates. The contents of the report and of the Subcommittee's deliberations shall not

be revealed to any persons not authorized to participate in the post-tenure review of the candidate.

4. After review of the Subcommittee's report and after review of each candidate's file by each member of the Committee, the Committee will meet to discuss the performance of the candidates. All discussion in this meeting will be kept confidential by all members.

5. After the meeting of the Committee, each member of the Committee will have 48 hours to complete a ballot in which to evaluate each candidate. Each candidate will be evaluated in writing in three areas: teaching, research scholarship, and service. Each member of the Committee will rate each candidate in each of three areas, rating performance in each area as either: "superior," "satisfactory," or "unsatisfactory." The evaluation of research scholarship will be the most important component of the evaluation. A rating of "unsatisfactory" in any area must be explained in writing. Each member of the Committee will also provide an overall evaluation of the candidate. A majority vote by those voting will be necessary to establish a recommendation by the committee that the candidate's record is satisfactory.

6. For purposes of post-tenure review, the performance rating terms will be defined as follows: Those rated "Superior" overall must have at least an Excellent record in both research and teaching and a Good record in research service; those rated "Satisfactory" overall must have at least a Good record in research and teaching and service; those rated "Unsatisfactory" overall are those whose performance, taken as a whole over the preceding six years, does not meet the standards for an overall rating of Satisfactory. A faculty member evaluated as Superior overall or as Satisfactory overall will receive a written summary or copy of the post-tenure review report.

7. The Chair of the department will tabulate the votes for each candidate in each of the three categories and the overall evaluations, and prepare a report of the post tenure review of each candidate. The report will record the vote of the Committee in each of the three categories and the overall evaluations, and will summarize the evaluations of the Committee in each category and the reasons or justification provided by members of the Committee. In addition, the report will provide the department chair's overall evaluation of the candidate, and the reasons for that evaluation. The report will also contain a summary of the votes and explanations provided by members of the Committee. The report should contain sufficient comments to aid the faculty member in his/her professional growth and development.

8. The chair of the department will give the letter to the faculty member who was reviewed together with a copy of the Subcommittee report. A copy of the letter and of the report will be retained in the faculty member's personnel file. The Dean will also be sent a copy of the letter and the Subcommittee report. Copies of unsatisfactory post-tenure reviews and the associated development plans will also be sent to the Provost.

9. An Unsatisfactory Review

a. If the post-tenure review report assesses a faculty member's overall performance as unsatisfactory, the department chair shall provide the faculty member a copy of the post-tenure review report, redacted to remove references that would identify any external reviewers, along with any recommendations for a development plan. If the department chair's report indicates that the overall performance of the faculty member is "unsatisfactory", the report will include recommendations to assist in restoring the faculty member's performance to a satisfactory level. The chair of the department, after consultation with members of the Subcommittee, will appoint a development committee to produce a plan that would assist the faculty member in reaching his/her development goals.

b. The department chair, in consultation with the faculty member and his/her development committee, will produce a development plan including an improvement timetable for the faculty member to bring his/her overall performance up to a satisfactory level. The timetable is at the discretion of the department chair, but in no case will the development plan timetable be less than one year nor more than three years in duration.

c. In accordance with the timetable established in the development plan, the development committee will review the faculty member's updated file and will submit an evaluation of progress to the department chair. The chair of the department will make the final determination on the progress, or lack thereof, of the faculty member in meeting the goals of the development plan, and whether or not future measures may be necessary. The department chair will conform to the timetable established in the development plan, and will file periodic progress reports with the dean of the college and the Provost.

d. Failure to meet the performance goals of a development plan established through the post-tenure review process may expose a faculty member to proceedings leading to termination.

F. Appeal Procedures

1. A faculty member who receives an unsatisfactory review and disagrees with the evaluation or any aspect of the recommendations may appeal to the dean of the college. Alternatively, a faculty member who receives an unsatisfactory review and disagrees with the evaluation of any aspect of the recommendations may appeal to the Committee. The findings of the Committee, together with its recommendations for action and a statement by the faculty member will be forwarded to the dean for final determination of the evaluation.

2. If a faculty member disagrees with the development plan produced by the department chair, he/she may appeal any specific aspects of the development plan or its timetable to the dean of the college. The dean of the college will make the final determination of the adequacy of an appealed development plan.

VII. Amendments

A. Amendments to these by-laws may be made by majority vote of the Department, provided that such proposals be made in writing and distributed to Faculty members one week before the meeting. Amendments may only be adopted during the academic year.

B. Section V, Faculty Tenure and Promotion, may only be changed by a majority vote of the tenured faculty.

VIII. Concluding Provision

A. Nothing in these by-laws should be interpreted in a manner that is in conflict with the *Faculty Manual* or existing University policies and processes.