

PERSONNEL DOCUMENT FOR DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

Mission Statement

The Department of Political Science seeks to advance the teaching, research, and service goals of Fulbright College by serving a diverse student body and faculty. The department offers an undergraduate program that fosters interdisciplinary liberal arts education, and graduate programs that are designed to prepare students for active citizenship, varied professional careers, and academia. Our curriculum offers students opportunities to explore domestic and international affairs, and to develop conceptual, verbal, and methodological skills that will inspire them to become life-long learners.

Revised Duties 8/2018

Personnel Policy Committee (PPC)

The faculty of the Political Science department elects, at the beginning of each fall semester, the departmental personnel policy committee (PPC). The committee is composed of a committee chair, who must be a tenured faculty member and receives the majority of the votes cast, and three tenured and tenure-track faculty members in the department. This committee shall participate in the annual review of each faculty member's performance in accordance with the provisions of the campus personnel document, and other personnel matters as assigned.

The Department Chair serves *ex officio* on the Committee except for matters involving annual merit evaluations and promotion decisions for individual faculty members.

Personnel Files of Faculty Members

The department maintains a personnel file for each faculty member employed in the department. These files are stored in a secure file cabinet in the Department Chair's office as well as a secure server site and are only accessible by the chair and the senior staff person who also updates the files. Faculty members can, upon request, view their files. Files cannot be removed from the departmental office area.

Work Assignments

Faculty work assignments are a specific responsibility of the Department Chair. Assignments are made by the Department Chair based on the best interests and needs of the department and the institution as a whole. The standard workload of tenured and tenure-track in the department of Political Science is 40/40/20 for teaching, research and service. Tenured and tenure-track faculty in the Political Science department are typically assigned to teach two classes in most semesters. Should a faculty member receive a grant that allows him or her to buy out a class, the faculty member must consult with the Department Chair how the faculty member's teaching assignments are to be met. Likewise, any absence from campus must receive prior approval by the Department Chair to avoid disruptions in teaching schedules.

Faculty, who assume additional administrative duties, such as directors of programs or the vice-chair/graduate coordinator, can request a re-allocation of their work assignments commensurate

with their workloads and with approval of the Dean. Other circumstances that may warrant re-assignments include persistent lack of research productivity. If faculty are not producing published research, the Department Chair may modify a faculty member's workload assignment if necessary to fulfill the educational mission of the university and in the best interest of the department.

Criteria and Procedures for Initial Appointment

The department seeks to advance the highest standards of scholarship and teaching in our discipline to continually improve the department's reputation and its ability to attract and retain exceptional faculty and students. The criteria for the ranks for assistant professor, associate professor, and professor are listed below. For other ranks and positions that may be used by the department from time to time, consult the college or campus personnel documents (see Academic Policy Series 1405.13).

A. Criteria

1. Assistant Professor

- a. Ph.D. in political science or equivalent degree in a closely related discipline.
- b. Clear evidence of excellence in teaching and scholarly ability.
- c. Clear evidence of strong potential for a sustainable significant program of research.

2. Associate Professor

- a. Ph.D. in political science or equivalent degree in a closely related discipline.
- b. Substantial record of publication or creative work of high quality that suggests a foundation for a sustained scholarly career.
- c. Excellence in teaching, including teaching at an advanced level in the candidate's area of expertise.
- d. Service contributions on departmental, college, or university committees, community service, and professional organizations.

3. Professor Revised 12/4/18

- a. Ph.D. in political science or equivalent degree in a closely related discipline.
- b. Research/Scholarship** – Successful candidates for promotion to full professor must demonstrate outstanding performance by meeting two 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 part, this criterion can be evaluated by a written statement from the candidate describing the research program, including an account of its evolution and future expectations. Second, successful candidates will have a scholarly record that must be demonstrated by the kind of evidence of high quality externally-reviewed publications and at the level where candidate would have achieved a national and/or international reputation in his or her field(s) of specialization. In addition, this may include, but is not limited to, giving invited talks and participating in invited workshops, organizing and chairing of panels at international and national conferences, serving as an expert on

national and international research teams, and receiving competitive grants to support research.

- c. **Teaching** – Candidates for promotion to full professor must demonstrate excellent level of performance in this area by meeting three criteria. First, 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. Second, the candidate will ordinarily have a record establishing that he or she has offered a range of courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels within the Department. While different candidates are likely to have taught different combinations of courses, 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.

- d. **Service** -- Candidates for promotion to full professor will have established a record of both internal and external service (e.g., positions in professional associations, editorial board membership, mentoring students and colleagues outside of the institution) that help establish a candidate’s national and/or reputation in his or her field(s) of specialization. The quality of a candidate’s performance in these capacities should be an important factor in the evaluation of the overall service. Recognition will also be accorded for contributions to the community, the state, or the nation, but only if they are broadly related to an individual’s occupational and professional duties.

B. Procedures

1. **Search Committee- Addendum 8/18**

The department chair will appoint four members to participate in the search process for new faculty members. The chair will select three members whose research and teaching focus align with the parameters of the search and one member whose research and teaching interest are in a different subfield. The department chair will also select the committee chair, who will represent the field in which the search is in. The committee will be responsible for the screening and interviewing of applicants.

2. **Initial screening:** When the department has been authorized to fill a position, the **Search Committee** and the Department Chair will develop a description of requirements and desired field specialties prior to publishing announcements of the vacancy.

3. **Position Advertisement:** Pursuant to its Diversity Plan and to attract a diverse pool of qualified applicants, the department will advertise the position in a wide variety of print or online publications.
4. **Decision for recommendation:** After a review of the candidate files by the PPC, the Department Chair will convene a meeting of the tenured and tenure-track faculty to vote on recommendation of a desired candidate. The Department Chair will consider the recommendation of the majority of the voting faculty before making a recommendation to the Dean.

5. Voting Process for Candidates – Addendum 1/18

Following the finalists' interviews, the name of each finalist shall be placed on the ballot. Each eligible faculty member is allotted one vote. If a finalist receives a majority of the votes cast, s/he is recommended to the Chair.

However, if no one receives a majority in the initial election, the two finalists with the most votes shall be in a run-off. The finalist with the majority of votes in a run-off is recommended to the Chair.

Or, if no one receives a majority in the initial election and there is a tie for second place, the top three finalists shall be in a run-off. The finalist with a majority of votes in a run-off is recommended to the Chair. If no one receives a majority in the run-off election, the vote totals for all three finalists will be submitted to Chair.

Successive Appointments and Annual Review

The department believes that it is important that an individual manifest a solid record of achievement in the discipline as a prerequisite to a positive annual performance review and recommendation for reappointment of those persons not yet tenured.

The department considers excellence and consistency in teaching, research, and service as essential for making decisions discussed in this section. Unless otherwise determined by mutual agreement between the Department Chair and the individual faculty and approved by the Dean, the weighing of yearly performance reviews shall be as described by the Fulbright College Personnel Document.

Teaching

There are certain identifiable elements that indicate good teaching. These may include, but are not limited to, regular academic counseling beyond immediate course consultations; positive teaching evaluation by students; evidence of high standards in course content and assessment of student performance, peer review, and course innovations; and development of new courses.

Research

In evaluating research skills and accomplishments, the department considers opinions from outside the university concerning the quality of research. This evaluation includes, but is not limited to, weighing the number and quality of published books and refereed articles, professional convention papers which have been subject to peer commentary, and grant proposals submitted or obtained after competitive review.

Service

The major criteria concerning service excellence have external and internal dimensions. Externally, such activities are judged in terms of active participation at professional meetings, accepting normal professional responsibilities such as professional editorial work, membership on professional committees, and serving as officers of professional associations.

Internal excellence is to be judged in terms of active service on department, college, and university committees. It is important for each person to cooperate with and contribute to all departmental collegial activities; this does not imply agreement with existing conditions, but it does mean a sustained effort to become involved in departmental activities and in a highly professional manner. Moreover, each member should bear a proportionate share of the departmental workload.

Tenure-track faculty members are expected to maintain steady progress toward a positive recommendation for eventual tenure. Such progress shall be evaluated on the basis of consistent accomplishments in all three categories (teaching, research, and service), and in the case of a deficiency in any category, evidence of subsequent improvement.

C. Procedures

1. Annual Review

The performance of each faculty member shall be evaluated annually by the Department Chair and members of the PPC. The committee's elected members review materials submitted by each faculty member and forward their evaluation to the faculty member and the Department Chair. Each faculty member has the right to appeal, through the committee chair of the PPC, for a hearing before the full committee.

Recommendations in appeals on annual merit evaluations shall be made by the PPC to the Department Chair. The Department Chair then makes a separate evaluation, typically based on the documentation provided through the PPC's review. After the annual review process is completed, the Department Chair shall schedule a meeting with each faculty member to discuss the resulting evaluation before transmitting a final evaluation to the

Dean. The faculty member shall have a reasonable opportunity to submit a written response to be forwarded to the Dean. A record of such meetings will be kept by the committee chair or another designated member of the PPC.

2. Reappointment

In addition to the annual merit review, each non-tenured tenure-track faculty member will meet jointly with the Department Chair and the PPC committee chair each year to assess his/her current status with respect to reappointment and continuing progress toward a positive recommendation for the granting of tenure.

Subsequently, the Department Chair will prepare a written recommendation to the Dean regarding continued reappointment, with a copy provided to the prospective candidate. When a recommendation for non-reappointment is made, the faculty member may appeal to the PPC for reconsideration before the Department Chair submits his/her recommendation to the Dean. In the event of an appeal, the Department Chair will consider the PPC's recommendation before submitting a final recommendation to the Dean.

Criteria and Procedures for Annual Performance Reviews and Recommendations for Reappointment

A. Performance Criteria

1. Teaching Activities

- 1.1 Courses taught during year (provide course number, name, enrollment and evidence of teaching effectiveness). Report the mean of core medians from the Purdue form. Other measures of teaching effectiveness may be included, such as personal statements or portfolios.
- 1.2 Individual Instruction
 - Students directed in independent study courses
 - Honors theses directed
 - Honors theses committee
 - Senior theses directed
 - Master's theses committees
 - Master's theses directed
 - Doctoral dissertation committees
 - Doctoral advising committees
 - Doctoral dissertations directed
- 1.3 Advising
 - Program advising (graduate and undergraduate students)
 - Other advising activities

1.4 Curriculum Development (e.g. new classes developed; substantial changes/revisions of existing classes; incorporation of new technologies into the instructional process)

1.5 Honors, awards, and activities not mentioned above

2. Research, Scholarly, Artistic, Creative Activities

2.1 Work in progress (title of articles, chapters, books, and conference papers, and likely dates of completion/submission)

2.2 Grant proposals submitted (title of project, funding agency, total dollar amount requested, role of faculty member)

2.3 Grants awarded (title of project, funding agency, total dollar amounts requested, role of faculty member)

2.4 Refereed publications or equivalent creative activities

- Work published during the year
- Work accepted for publication/in press

2.5 Non-refereed reports/publications or non-juried creative endeavors

2.6 Papers presented at professional meetings

2.7 Honors, awards, and other activities not mentioned above

3. Service

3.1 Professional (specify activity and whether national, regional, or state)

3.2 Departmental, college, university (appointed or elected positions on committees/commissions; role of the faculty member and approximate time devoted to the activity)

3.3 Community engagement

3.4 Honors, awards and other service activities not mentioned above

2. Performance Ratings

The department has decided to adopt the following decimal system to assess faculty across the stated criteria outlined in Part A of this segment:

1. Teaching

3.0: “Exceeds Expectations”

A rating of “Exceeds Expectations” indicates excellence in teaching. Examples may include a combination of the following:

- Teaching awards or nominations
- Excellent student evaluations or student success as evidenced by awards, publications, or presentations at professional conferences
- Making substantive and innovative contributions to teaching
- Chairing undergraduate or graduate student theses or dissertations
- Teaching above and beyond the required teaching load or exceptional engagement in mentoring students

A rating of “Exceeds Expectations” would also be warranted for faculty who make substantial contributions to the department’s teaching mission over and above what is normally expected.

2.0-2.9: “Meets Expectations Fully”

A rating of “Meets Expectations Fully” indicates strong performance in teaching. Examples may include:

- Very good student evaluations
- New course preparation or innovative course development
- Supervising independent studies or undergraduate honors theses, or serving on thesis or dissertation committees

1.0-1.9: “Minimally Meets Expectations”

A rating of “Minimally Meets Expectations” indicates satisfactory performance in teaching. Examples may include:

- Fair student evaluations
- Syllabi suggest course content that is adequate in terms of rigor
- Professor is minimally available to students for consultation
- Completion of assigned teaching responsibilities but does not meet the criteria for a rating of “Meets Expectations Fully”

0.0-0.9: “Does Not Meet Expectations”

A rating of “Does Not Meet Expectations” indicates unsatisfactory performance in teaching. Examples may include:

- Routinely not holding classes
- Refusing a reasonable teaching assignment
- Documented failure to direct progress of graduate students for whom the faculty member serves as thesis chair
- Exceptionally poor student evaluations

- Teaching misconduct and/or failure to treat students with professionalism
- Refusal to submit grades according to stated deadlines

2. Research

3.0 “Exceeds Expectations”

A rating of “Exceeds Expectations” indicates excellence in research and scholarship.

Examples may include a combination of the following:

- Publication in highly regarded peer-reviewed journals
- Publication of a book in a well-regarded academic or university press
- National research awards or management of significant or multi-year external funding
- Invited presentations as a keynote speaker or subject matter expert for national or international meetings, Congressional or federal agencies, or highly acclaimed symposia

2.0-2.9: “Meets Expectations Fully”

A rating of “Meets Expectations Fully” indicates strong performance in research and scholarship. Examples may include:

- Publication in good peer-reviewed journals
- Competitive external or internal funding
- Award of a book contract from a reputable professional, academic, or university press

1.0-1.9: “Minimally Meets Expectations”

A rating of “Minimally Meets Expectations” is warranted when clear evidence of research or other scholarly activity is present, but when such activity has not resulted in the publication of original research or external funding awards. Examples may include:

- Documented evidence of progress on a major project (e.g., data collection or analysis, preparation of a manuscript for submission to a journal or publishing house, or preparation of a funding proposal)
- Presentation of a paper at a regional or national conference
- Publication of a book review or encyclopedia entry or participation in research workshops and/or professional training

0.0-0.9: “Does Not Meet Expectations”

A rating of “Does Not Meet Expectations” indicates unsatisfactory research and scholarship. Examples may include: following:

- Breaches of professional conduct
- No evidence of research presented at professional meetings, submitted works for review, research reports, grant proposals and/or other organized research activity

3. Service

3.0: “Exceeds expectations”

A rating of “Exceeds Expectations” indicates excellence in service. Examples may

include a combination of the following:

- Chairing of a standing or ad hoc committee
- Election to national office
- Service on review panels or editorial boards
- Awards, evaluation by peers for service activities, or other signs of recognition for contributions to the discipline, university, or community relevant to the university's mission as a land-grant institution

2.0-2.9: "Meets Expectations Fully"

A rating of "Meets Expectations Fully" indicates strong service to the department, college, university and/or academy. Examples may include:

- Service on several committees
- Service to the profession through activity such as editorial duties, reviewing for peer-reviewed journals or funding agencies
- Service to professional societies or organizing sessions at professional meetings
- Service may also entail contributing specific professional expertise for nonprofit and governmental agencies and/or community outreach efforts aligned with the mission of a land-grant institution

1.0-1.9: "Minimally Meets Expectations"

A rating of "Minimally Meets Expectations" indicates satisfactory but limited service to the department, college, and/or university. Examples may include:

- Service on a standing or ad hoc committee
- Participation in departmental affairs

0.0-0.9: "Does Not Meet Expectations"

A rating of "Does Not Meet Expectations" indicates unsatisfactory service and may be given when no evidence of service exists or when a faculty member refuses to submit such evidence or to carry out assigned duties or demonstrates an unwillingness to serve.

4. Procedures

1. The elected PPC will convene each year to carefully evaluate each faculty member's work in accordance with the stated criteria in Part A (above)
2. The Department Chair will receive the recommendations from the PPC and perform a separate evaluation of the faculty member's work and provide a detailed narrative to justify the score given.
3. Faculty members have the right to appeal as detailed elsewhere in the document.

Criteria and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure

The following are guided by Academic Policy 1405.11.

A. Criteria for Promotion

For all ranks and positions other than Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor, the College Personnel Document should be consulted. Generally, the criteria indicated above for initial appointments at the various ranks will be adhered to in promotion reviews.

Promotions to the ranks of Associate Professor and Professor are recommended only upon the basis of a sustained record of superior performance. While the candidate's prior record of total accomplishments, and especially those accomplishments occurring since appointment or promotion to the present rank, provide the primary basis for promotion recommendations, a judgment about future performance is also necessary, hence the concern with sustained performance beyond appointment to rank.

B. Criteria for Tenure

The primary criterion for positive recommendations for the granting of tenure is a sustained record of performance that indicates that the candidate will continue to make significant contributions in scholarship, teaching, and service.

Promotion procedures

1. In consultation with the PPC, the Department Chair shall consider nominations for promotion at the beginning of each academic year. Any faculty member may request to be nominated for promotion.
2. The candidate will be evaluated by the elected members of the PPC and by the Department Chair independently. The PPC committee chair will convene a meeting of all tenured faculty in the department after they have had an opportunity to review the candidate's documented credentials, including the evaluations of at least three external evaluators within the political science discipline. The PPC will vote and the PPC committee chair will provide a written report of the results of that meeting to the Department Chair. The tenured faculty will then be asked to vote on the promotion. The Department Chair will make a separate written assessment of the candidate. Both reports will be transmitted to the Dean.
3. If either or both recommendations are negative, the candidate may: 1) request that the promotion application be terminated without prejudice and not be transmitted to the Dean, or, 2) appeal to the voting faculty (all tenure and tenure-track personnel) as a whole convened by the PPC committee chair. In the latter case, the Department Chair is obligated to reassess the application in the light of the findings of the faculty as a whole and transmit his or her final assessment to the Dean.

Tenure review procedures

1. The PPC committee chair will convene a meeting of all tenured faculty in the department after they have had an opportunity to review the tenure candidate's documented credentials, including the evaluations of at least three external evaluators within the political science discipline. The PPC committee chair will provide the results of the committee's vote, the vote of the unit faculty, and a written report to the Department Chair. The Department Chair will make a separate written assessment of the tenure track candidate. Both reports will be transmitted to the Dean.
2. If either or both recommendations are negative, the candidate may 1) request that the tenure application be terminated (without prejudice if it is an early application) and not be transmitted to the Dean, or, 2) appeal for reconsideration by the tenured faculty. The PPC committee chair will convene the meeting, and the candidate may provide such new evidence as he or she may feel pertinent, including an oral statement of appeal. In the latter case, the Department Chair is obligated to reassess the application in the light of the findings of the tenured faculty and transmit his or her final assessment to the Dean.

Addendum for Clinical Faculty Revised 12/4/18

According to Academic Policy 1405.102, clinical faculty are non-tenure-track faculty who are primarily assigned to teaching or clinical/service-based settings. While their principal duties are teaching, there is an expectation of research/scholarly/creative activity, service, and teaching when a clinical faculty member is considered for promotion.

A. Work assignments

The standard workload of clinical faculty in the Department of Political Science is 80/10/10 for teaching, research, and service. Clinical faculty in the Department are typically assigned to teach four classes in most semesters.

B. Reappointment

In addition to the annual merit review, clinical faculty will meet jointly with the Department Chair and the PPC Chair each year to assess his/her current status with respect to reappointment. Subsequently, the Department Chair will prepare a written recommendation to the Dean regarding continued reappointment with a copy provided to the prospective candidate. When a recommendation for non-reappointment is made, the faculty member may appeal to the PPC for reconsideration before the Chair submits his/her recommendation to the Dean.

C. Performance Criteria

The annual review performance criteria for clinical professors follow those for tenured and tenure-track faculty.

D. Criteria for Promotion

According to Policy 1405.102 "only in exceptional, well documented, cases should a faculty member be recommended for promotion when he/she has completed fewer than

five years in rank.”

1. Clinical Associate Professor:

- a. Ph.D. in political science or equivalent degree in a closely related discipline.
- b. Excellence in teaching, including teaching at an advanced level in the candidate's area of expertise.
- c. Record of publication or creative work of high quality that suggests a foundation for a scholarly career, including, but not limited to, the presentation of teaching-related studies at scholarly conferences, coauthoring works with undergraduate students, and publishing articles and book reviews on program-related or teaching-related topics.
- d. Service contributions on departmental, college, or university committees, community service, and professional organizations.

2. Clinical Professor:

- a. Ph.D. in political science or equivalent degree in a closely related discipline.
- b. Excellence in teaching at all levels of appropriate degree programs.
- c. Substantial record of publication or creative work of high quality, including, but not limited to, the presentation of teaching-related studies at scholarly conferences, coauthoring works with undergraduate students, and publishing articles and book reviews on program-related or teaching-related topics.
- d. Competent service in one or more of the following: departmental administration, college or university committees, community service, and professional organizations.

Promotion Procedures- Addendum 12/4/18

1. In consultation with the PPC, the Department Chair shall consider nominations for promotion at the beginning of each academic year. Any clinical faculty member may request to be nominated for promotion.
2. To submit an application for tenure and promotion, candidates shall submit materials for their tenure and promotion file using the University Faculty Review Checklist for tenure and tenure-track faculty. The application file will also include all previous annual evaluations. Clinical faculty at other universities at or above the clinical rank for which the candidate is applying will conduct an external review of the candidate. The candidate’s materials must not conflict with, or be less rigorous than, the criteria for promotion noted in the Academic Policy Series Promotion and Guidelines (1405.102).
3. The Political Science Personnel Policy Committee (PPC) shall review all materials submitted by the candidate and all letters submitted by external reviewers. The PPC will provide a summary of its review of the candidate’s file and provide a recommendation to the Chair of the Department of Political Science. The Political Science Chair shall conduct his or her promotion review and will produce a letter evaluating the candidate’s file. Once copy of the Chair’s letter will be included in, the candidate’s personnel file in the department and another will be submitted to the Dean’s Office.

4. Faculty in the Political Science Department will vote on the candidate's promotion. Faculty who hold the rank of Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Professor, Associate Professor, Professor, or higher shall be eligible to participate in the vote on the promotion of Clinical Assistant Professors. Faculty who hold the rank of Clinical Professor, Professor, or higher shall be eligible to participate in the vote to promotion of Clinical Professor.
5. If either or both recommendations of the PPC and the Chair are negative, the candidate may: 1) request that the promotion application be terminated without prejudice and not be transmitted to the Dean, or, 2) appeal to the voting faculty (all tenured and tenure-track faculty) as a whole convened by the PPC committee chair. In the latter case, the Department Chair is obligated to reassess the application in the light of the findings of the faculty as a whole and transmit his or her final assessment to the Dean.