

Personnel Document
On Evaluative Criteria, Procedures and General Standards
for
Initial Appointment, Successive Appointments,
Annual and Post-tenure Review,
Promotion and Tenure

University of Arkansas
Department of Political Science

This document governs the Department in the selection, retention, promotion, granting of tenure to, and evaluation of faculty effective as of the date of the president's approval. It has been approved by the faculty of the Department of Political Science, the Dean, the Provost, the Chancellor, and the President of the University of Arkansas, as indicated by the signatures below.

These policies are required to be consistent with the policies of the university as set forth in Board of Trustees policy 405.1 and in two campus policy statements: (1) Evaluative Criteria, Procedures and General Standards for Initial Appointment, Successive Appointments, Annual and Post-Tenure Review, and Promotion and Tenure, (2) Guidelines on University and Distinguished Professors Appointments. In case of conflict, the board policy, the campus policy, the school, college, or library policy, and the department policy shall have authority in that order. Copies of these documents are available online, as referenced in the *Faculty Handbook*, at the UA web site <https://provost.uark.edu/faculty-handbook>.

It is the policy of the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville to provide equal employment opportunity to all qualified persons; to prohibit discrimination against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, color, religion, sex, age, national origin, sexual orientation, marital or parental status, veteran's status, or disability, and to promote the full realization of equal employment opportunity through a positive, continuing program of affirmative action.

APPROVALS



9/6/20

Chair

Date



9/28/2020

Dean

Date

Provost

Date

Chancellor

Date

President

Date

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 and varied professional careers. 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.

I. Duties and Committee Structure: Peer Review Committee (PRC), Personnel Policy Committee (PPC), and ad hoc Search Committees (SC)

A. Peer Review Committee (PRC)

1. The PRC shall participate in the annual review of each faculty member's performance in accordance with the provisions of this personnel document, the college personnel document, and the campus personnel document.
2. Selection
 - a) The tenured, tenure-track and full time, non-tenure track faculty (as defined by APS 1405.11) of the Department of Political Science shall elect, at the beginning of each fall semester, the departmental Peer Review Committee (PRC).
 - b) All full-time, tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty above the rank of assistant professor shall be eligible to serve on the Peer Review Committee. In addition, tenure-track and non-tenure track assistant professors, having successfully completed three academic years of service in the Department, shall be eligible to serve.
 - c) Individual faculty members will cast their ballots for four candidates to the PRC, indicating a "4" for first preference, "3" for their second preference, "2" for their third preference, and "1" for the fourth preference.
 - d) Members of the PRC shall elect a chair from among its members to coordinate the work of the committee.

B. Personnel Policy Committee (PPC)

1. The PPC shall participate in the promotion and tenure review process for faculty members in the department, the reappointment process for tenure-track and full time, non-tenure track faculty, and all other personnel matters as assigned by the Department Chair.
2. Selection

- a) The tenured, tenure-track, and full time, non-tenure track faculty at or above the rank of assistant professor (as defined by APS 1405.11) of the Political Science Department, are eligible to vote other than (1) a faculty member who has received notification of non-reappointment or termination, or (2) visiting faculty members, shall elect, at the beginning of each fall semester, the departmental Personnel Policy Committee (PPC).
- b) Individual faculty members will cast their ballots for four candidates at the associate professor rank or higher to the PPC, indicating a “4” for first preference, “3” for their second preference, “2” for their third preference, and “1” for the fourth preference.
- c) The PPC is composed of (1) a committee chair, who must be a tenured faculty member and has received the most votes cast; and (2) a committee vice-chair, who must be a tenured faculty member and has received the second most votes cast; and (3) one member of the faculty who received the third highest number of votes cast.
- d) If the department has fewer than two full time, non-tenure track faculty members, the faculty member who received the fourth highest number of votes cast will be the fourth member of the PPC.
- e) If the department has two or more full time, non-tenure track faculty members, and none of the faculty members who received the three largest number of votes is a full time, non-tenure track faculty member of the level of associate professor or higher, the full time, non-tenure track faculty member who is associate professor or higher who received the largest number of votes shall be the fourth member of the PPC. In the event of a tie between the full time, non-tenure track, another election shall be held among the faculty members for the remaining seat, with each faculty member casting a single vote for each full time, non-tenure track faculty candidate who is an associate professor or higher.
- f) If the department has the two or more full time, non-tenure track faculty members, and one of the full time, non-tenure track faculty members who is associate professor or higher receives the first, second, or third largest numbers of votes, the tenure track faculty member at who is associate professor or higher who received the fourth largest number of votes shall be the fourth member of the PPC.
- g) Full time, non-tenure track faculty members serving on the PPC shall not vote on the awarding of tenure but may vote on the promotion or reappointment of tenure-track faculty members at their rank or lower.

C. The Department Chair

1. The Department Chair serves *ex officio* on the PRC except for matters involving annual merit evaluations.
 2. The Department Chair will serve *ex officio on the PPC* except on matters involving tenure and promotion decisions for individual faculty members.
 3. The Department Chair is ineligible for election to either the PRC or the PPC and cannot vote for members for either committee.
- D. Ad hoc search committees
1. The Department Chair will appoint four members to an ad hoc search committee (SC) to participate in the search process for new faculty members when and if a faculty position is open.
 2. The Department 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.
 3. The Department Chair will 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.
 4. If multiple faculty searches occur in a given year, the chair may create separate committees for each search.

II. **Criteria and Procedures for Initial Appointment to Tenure Track Ranks**

- A. 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, see Section V "Full-Time, Non-Tenure Track Faculty" below and consult the college or campus personnel documents, as well as 1435.50 and 1405.111 (as to non-tenure track faculty).
- B. 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) A 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
- a) Ph.D. in political science or equivalent degree in a closely related discipline.
 - b) Research/Scholarship –An applicant should meet two criteria.
 - (1) 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.
 - (2) 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 – An applicant should demonstrate excellent level of performance in this area by meeting two criteria.
 - (1) 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.
 - (2) 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 – An applicant should 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.

C. Procedures for Tenure Track Faculty Searches

1. Initial screening: When the department has been authorized to fill a position, the ad hoc search committee and the Department Chair will develop a description of requirements and desired field specialties prior to publishing announcements of the vacancy.
2. Position advertisement: Pursuant to the department’s Diversity and Inclusion 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.
3. Decision for recommendation: After a review of the candidate files by the ad hoc search committee, 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.
4. Voting Process for Candidates
5. 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 Department Chair.
6. 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 Department Chair.
7. 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 the Department Chair.

D. Personnel Files of Faculty Members

1. The department maintains a personnel file that is the official record 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.

E. Work Assignments

1. Faculty work assignments are the 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.
2. Standard Workload Distribution:
 - a) The standard workload distribution of tenured and tenure-track in the department of Political Science is 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service.
 - b) Tenured and tenure-track faculty in the Department of Political Science are typically assigned to teach two classes each semester.
 - c) Deviations may include, but are not limited to, the following:
 - (1) 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.
 - d) Any absence from campus must receive prior approval by the Department Chair to avoid disruptions in teaching schedules.
 - e) 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.
 - f) 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.

III. Successive Appointments, Annual Review, Peer Review, Third Year Review, and Post-Tenure Review (Performance Criteria for Annual Performance Reviews and Recommendations for Reappointment)

A. Overview

1. The performance of each faculty member shall be evaluated annually by the Department Chair and members of the PRC. The committee's elected members review materials submitted by each faculty member and forward their evaluation to the faculty member and the Department Chair.

2. Tenure-track faculty members are expected to maintain steady progress toward a positive recommendation for eventual tenure. Such progress shall be evaluated based on consistent accomplishments in all three categories (teaching, research, and service), and in the case of a deficiency in any category, evidence of subsequent improvement.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. The following criteria will be used by the Department Chair and the PRC when they conduct annual evaluations of faculty.

B. Teaching Activities

1. Courses taught during the year (provide course number, name, enrollment and evidence of teaching effectiveness). These measures should include the mean of core evaluation questions (e.g., "I would rate this course...", "I would rate this instructor...") from the CourseEval teaching evaluation reports, which are reported on the University Digital Measures site, as well as other measures included by the instructor. Other measures of teaching effectiveness that may be included, such as personal statements or portfolios. These items will include the numbers related to:
 - a) Individual Instruction
 - b) Students directed in independent study courses
 - c) Honors theses directed
 - d) Honors theses committee
 - e) Senior theses directed
 - f) Master's theses committees
 - g) Master's theses directed
 - h) Doctoral dissertation committees
 - i) Doctoral advising committees
 - j) Doctoral dissertations directed
2. Advising
 - a) Program advising (graduate and undergraduate students)
 - b) Other advising activities

3. Curriculum Development (e.g., new classes developed; substantial changes/revisions of existing classes; incorporation of new technologies into the instructional process)
 4. Honors, awards, and activities not mentioned above
- C. Research, Scholarly, Artistic, Creative Activities
1. Work in progress (title of articles, chapters, books, and conference papers, and likely dates of completion/submission)
 2. Grant proposals submitted (title of project, funding agency, total dollar amount requested, role of faculty member)
 3. Grants awarded (title of project, funding agency, total dollar amounts requested, role of faculty member)
 4. Refereed publications or equivalent creative activities
 5. Work published during the year
 6. Work accepted for publication/in press
 7. Non-refereed reports/publications or non-juried creative endeavors
 8. Papers presented at professional meetings
 9. Honors, awards, and other activities not mentioned above
- D. Service
1. Professional (specify activity and whether national, regional, or state)
 2. Departmental, college, university (appointed or elected positions on committees/commissions; role of the faculty member and approximate time devoted to the activity)
 3. Community engagement
 4. Honors, awards and other service activities not mentioned above
- E. Performance ratings: The following decimal system will be used to assess faculty across the criteria stated above.
1. Teaching
 - a) 3.0: "Exceeds Expectations": A rating of "Exceeds Expectations" indicates excellence in teaching. Examples may include a combination of the following:
 - (1) Teaching awards or nominations
 - (2) Excellent student evaluations or student success as evidenced by awards, publications, or presentations at professional conferences
 - (3) Making substantive and innovative contributions to teaching
 - (4) Chairing undergraduate or graduate student theses or dissertations
 - (5) Teaching above and beyond the required teaching load or exceptional engagement in mentoring students

- (6) 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.
 - b) 2.0-2.9: “Meets Expectations Fully”: A rating of “Meets Expectations Fully” indicates strong performance in teaching. Examples may include:
 - (1) New course preparation or innovative course development
 - (2) Very good student evaluations
 - (3) Supervising independent studies or undergraduate honors theses, or serving on thesis or dissertation committees
 - c) 1.0-1.9: “Minimally Meets Expectations”: A rating of “Minimally Meets Expectations” indicates satisfactory performance in teaching. Examples may include:
 - (1) Fair student evaluations
 - (2) Syllabi suggest course content that is adequate in terms of rigor
 - (3) Professor is minimally available to students for consultation
 - (4) Completion of assigned teaching responsibilities but does not meet the criteria for a rating of “Meets Expectations Fully”
 - d) 0.0-0.9: “Does Not Meet Expectations”: A rating of “Does Not Meet Expectations” indicates unsatisfactory performance in teaching. Examples may include:
 - (1) Routinely not holding classes
 - (2) Refusing a reasonable teaching assignment
 - (3) Documented failure to direct progress of graduate students for whom the faculty member serves as thesis chair
 - (4) Poor student evaluations
 - (5) Teaching misconduct and/or failure to treat students with professionalism
 - (6) Refusal to submit grades according to stated deadlines
2. Research
- a) 3.0 “Exceeds Expectations”: A rating of “Exceeds Expectations” indicates excellence in research and scholarship. Examples may include a combination of the following:
 - (1) Publication in highly regarded peer-reviewed journals
 - (2) Publication of a book in a well-regarded academic or university press
 - (3) National research awards or management of significant or multi-year external funding

- (4) Invited presentations as a keynote speaker or subject matter expert for national or international meetings, Congressional or federal agencies, or highly acclaimed symposia
 - b) 2.0-2.9: “Meets Expectations Fully”: A rating of “Meets Expectations Fully” indicates strong performance in research and scholarship. Examples may include:
 - (1) Publication in good peer-reviewed journals
 - (2) Competitive external or internal funding
 - (3) Award of a book contract from a reputable professional, academic, or university press
 - c) 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:
 - (1) 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)
 - (2) Presentation of a paper at a regional or national conference
 - (3) Publication of a book review or encyclopedia entry or participation in research workshops and/or professional training
 - d) 0.0-0.9: “Does Not Meet Expectations”: A rating of “Does Not Meet Expectations” indicates unsatisfactory research and scholarship. Examples may include:
 - (1) Breaches of professional conduct
 - (2) Limited or no evidence of research presented at professional meetings, submitted works for review, research reports, grant proposals and/or other organized research activity
3. Service
- a) 3.0: “Exceeds expectations”: A rating of “Exceeds Expectations” indicates excellence in service. Examples may include a combination of the following:
 - (1) Chairing of a standing or ad hoc committee
 - (2) Election to national office in a professional organization
 - (3) Service on review panels or editorial boards
 - (4) 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

- b) 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:
 - (1) Service on several committees
 - (2) Service to the profession through activity such as editorial duties, reviewing for peer- reviewed journals or funding agencies
 - (3) Service to professional societies or organizing sessions at professional meetings
 - (4) 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
 - c) 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:
 - (1) Service on a standing or ad hoc committee
 - (2) Participation in departmental affairs
 - d) 0.0-0.9: “Does Not Meet Expectations”:
 - (1) A rating of “Does Not Meet Expectations” indicates unsatisfactory service and may be given when little or 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
- a) The elected PRC will convene each year to carefully evaluate each faculty member’s work in accordance with the criteria stated above.
 - b) The Department Chair will receive the recommendations from the PRC and perform a separate evaluation of the faculty member’s work and provide a detailed narrative to justify the score given.
5. Appealing Annual Merit Score Values
- a) Each faculty member has the right to appeal, through the committee chair of the PRC, for a hearing before the full committee.
 - b) To commence the appeal, the faculty member seeking the appeal shall notify the chair of the PRC, indicating an appeal has commenced.
 - c) The chair of the PRC will convene a meeting of the PRC to hear the appeal. The appealing faculty has a right to present evidence in both written form and orally to the full committee.
 - d) The PRC shall make recommendations regarding appealed annual merit evaluations to the Department Chair.

- e) The Department Chair shall then make a separate evaluation, considering the recommendation provided through the PRC's review. After the annual review process is completed, the Department Chair shall schedule a meeting with the faculty member to discuss the resulting evaluation before transmitting a final evaluation to the Dean.
 - f) The faculty member shall have a reasonable opportunity to submit a written response to be forwarded to the Dean.
 - g) A record of such meetings will be kept by the committee chair or another designated member of the PRC.
- F. Reappointment of Tenure-Track Faculty
- 1. In addition to the annual merit review, each non-tenured tenure-track faculty member will meet jointly with the Department Chair and the PRC chair, to assess his/her current status with respect to reappointment and continuing progress toward a positive recommendation for the granting of tenure.
 - 2. The Department Chair will prepare a written recommendation to the Dean regarding continued reappointment, with a copy provided to the prospective candidate.
 - 3. 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.

IV. Criteria and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure

Criteria for promotion and tenure are established in 1405.11.IV. in the College Personnel Document. The following criteria are supplementary.

- A. Criteria for Promotion
 - 1. 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.
 - 2. 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

1. 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.
- C. 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. To submit an application for tenure and/or promotion, candidates shall submit materials for their tenure and/or promotion files using the University Faculty Review Checklist for tenure and tenure-track faculty. The application file will also include all previous annual evaluations. 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 Guideline (1405.11).
 3. Promotion to Full Professor
 - a) The letter of solicitation to prospective external evaluators must be available to the candidate before it is sent to the potential reviewers.
 - b) In the case of an application for promotion to the rank of professor, the candidate will be evaluated by the elected members of the PPC at the rank of full professor and by the Department Chair independently. In the event an application for a candidate for full professor is before a PPC composed of fewer than three individuals at or above the rank of full professor, the PPC Chair, the Department Chair, and the Dean shall, working together and with input from the candidate, select and secure one or more eligible members from within the Department. If a minimum of three cannot be found from within the Department, one or more eligible members may be selected and secured from related disciplines outside of the Department to serve on the committee for that candidate. The number of outside committee members appointed to the PPC shall not exceed the number required to ensure three voting members. These appointed members will vote on applications for full professor only. The PPC will vote and the PPC chair will provide a written report of the results of that meeting to the Department Chair.
 - c) The PPC chair will convene a meeting of all tenured faculty members in the department with the rank of professor and above 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.
 - d) The faculty at the rank of professor and above will then be asked to vote on the candidate's promotion.

- e) The Department Chair will make a separate written assessment of the candidate. Both reports will be transmitted to the Dean.
4. Promotion to Associate Professor:
- a) The letter of solicitation to the prospective external evaluators must be available to the candidate before it is sent to the potential reviewers.
 - b) In the case of an application for promotion to the rank of associate professor, the candidate will be evaluated by the elected tenured members of the PPC and by the Department Chair independently. In the event an application for a candidate for associate professor is before a PPC composed of fewer than three individuals at or above the rank of associate professor, the PPC Chair, the Department Chair, and the Dean shall, working together and with input from the candidate, select and secure one or more eligible members from within the Department. If a minimum of three cannot be found from within the Department, one or more eligible members may be selected and secured from related disciplines outside of the Department to serve on the committee for that candidate. The number of outside committee members appointed to the PPC shall not exceed the number required to ensure three voting members.
 - c) The PPC 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.
 - d) The PPC will vote and the PPC 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.
 - e) If either or both recommendations are negative:
 - (1) The candidate may:
 - (a) Request that the promotion application be terminated without prejudice and not be transmitted to the Dean, or,
 - (b) Appeal to the voting faculty (all tenured personnel in the case of promotion to the rank of associate professor and all tenured personnel with the rank of professor in the case of promotion to the rank of professor) as a whole, convened by the PPC chair.
 - (2) 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.

D. Tenure review procedures

1. The PPC 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.
2. The letter of solicitation to the prospective external evaluators must be available to the candidate before it is sent to the potential reviewers.
3. The PPC 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.
4. If either or both recommendations are negative, the candidate may
 - a) request that the tenure application be terminated (without prejudice if it is an early application) and not be transmitted to the Dean, or,
 - b) appeal for reconsideration by the tenured faculty.
 - c) The PPC 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.

V. Full-Time, Non-Tenure Track Faculty

A. Definition

1. ~~According to Academic Policy 1405.12,~~ Non-tenure track faculty 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 an eligible full time, non-tenure track faculty member is considered for promotion.
2. These positions include teaching assistant professor, teaching associate professor, research assistant professor, research associate professor, and other appointments with the modifier "professor of practice. "

B. Initial appointment

1. The Department Chair, in consultation with the chair of the PPC, shall appoint faculty to the non-tenure track faculty ranks Any successive appointments beyond one year for non-tenure track faculty are governed by APS 1405.11 and APS 1405.111. Except for faculty on merit-based, multi-year appointments which meet all criteria and procedural requirements set forth in APS 1405.11 II.D., APS 1405.111, and the Fulbright College Personnel Document, any such appointment (or reappointment) is at the sole discretion of the University.
- 2.

C. Work assignments

1. The standard workload of full time, non-tenure track faculty in the Department of Political Science is 80% teaching, 10% research, and 10% service. Full time, non-tenure track faculty in the Department are typically assigned to teach four classes in most semesters.
- D. Reappointment
1. In addition to the annual merit review, full time, non-tenure track faculty will meet jointly with the Department Chair and the PPC Chair as needed to assess his/her current status with respect to reappointment.
 2. 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 that a merit-based fulltime non-tenure track faculty member not be reappointed is made, the faculty member may appeal to the PPC for reconsideration before the Chair submits his/her recommendation to the Dean. Ultimately, however, reappointment is at the sole discretion of the University, subject to the provisions on merit-based, multi-year appointments contained in 405.1, 405.4, 1405.11, and 1405.111, as well as the Fulbright College Personnel Document.
- E. Annual Performance Criteria
1. The annual review performance criteria for full time, non-tenure track professors follow those for tenured and tenure-track faculty.
- F. Promotion in Rank Criteria
1. To submit an application for promotion, full time, non-tenure track faculty shall submit materials for their promotion files using the University Faculty Review Checklist. The application file will also include all previous annual evaluations. The candidate's materials must not conflict with, or be less rigorous than, the criteria for promotion noted in the Academic Policy Series Promotion Guidelines (APS 1405.11).
- G. Promotion in Rank
1. According to APS 1405.11, there is no minimum time in a given rank required for full time, non-tenure track professors before an eligible candidate applies for a promotion in rank.
- H. Criteria for Initial Appointment to ranks of:
1. Non-tenure track Assistant Professor
 - a) These include the ranks of teaching assistant professor and research assistant professor.
 - b) Ph.D. in political science or equivalent degree in a closely related discipline.
 - c) Experience in teaching in the candidate's area of expertise.
 - d) Record of publication or creative work.
 2. Non-tenure track Associate Professor

- a) These include the ranks of teaching associate professor and research associate professor.
 - b) Ph.D. in political science or equivalent degree in a closely related discipline.
 - c) Excellence in teaching, including teaching at an advanced level in the candidate's area of expertise.
 - d) Record of publication or creative work of high quality that suggests a foundation for a scholarly career.
 - e) Service contributions on departmental, college, or university committees, community service, and professional organizations.
 - f) Progress towards a state-wide, regional, national or international reputation in their discipline (APS 1505.11 section IV.A.1).
3. Non-tenure track Professor
- a) These include the ranks of teaching professor, research professor, and professor of practice.
 - b) Ph.D. in political science or equivalent degree in a closely related discipline.
 - c) Excellence in teaching at all levels of appropriate degree programs.
 - d) Substantial record of publication or creative work of high quality.
 - e) Competent service in one or more of the following: departmental administration, college or university committees, community service, and professional organizations.
 - f) A pattern of distinguished accomplishments in scholarship/achievement of a regional, national or international reputation (APS 1505.11 section IV.A.2).
4. Instructor
- a) M.A. or Ph.D. in political science or equivalent degree in a closely related discipline.
 - b) Demonstrated proficiency in teaching through evidence such as student and/or peer evaluations.
5. Advanced Instructor
- a) M.A. or Ph.D. in political science or equivalent degree in a closely related discipline.
 - b) Demonstrated pattern of pedagogical growth and accomplishment as demonstrated by evidence such as multiple years of student and peer evaluations.
6. Senior Instructor
- a) M.A. or Ph.D. in political science or equivalent degree in a closely related discipline.

- b) Demonstrated pattern of advanced pedagogical growth and excellence in teaching as demonstrated by evidence such as multiple years of student and peer evaluations.
- c) A pattern of professional development as demonstrated by evidence such as attendance at teaching-related events and the creation of a teaching portfolio.