

# **Governance Document**

## **Department of Political Science**

### **January, 2024**

## **Preamble**

This Governance Document provides an institutional framework through which the Department of Political Science can transact its business, fulfill its responsibilities, and pursue its objectives. It is not intended to be a detailed code of practices and procedures. The Governance Document is subsumed under the authority of the University and the LAS College; University and College policy is supreme in the event of conflicting provisions. This preamble is not a binding part of the Governance Document. All other sections of the Governance Document are binding.

*The departmental Governance Document consists of four sections – one outlining the organizational structure and operation of the Department, a second the Promotion and Tenure Policy for tenure eligible faculty of the Department, a third the Term Faculty Policy of the Department, and a fourth the Post-Tenure Review Policy of the Department. All these elements together comprise the departmental Governance Document.*

## **Article I: Organizational Structure and Operation of the Department of Political Science**

The mission of the Department of Political Science at Iowa State University focuses on establishing excellence in learning, discovery, and engagement, through fostering diversity in topics of instruction, in areas of research, and in student, faculty, and staff backgrounds and perspectives, consistent with the University's Strategic Plan. We seek to enable our undergraduate and graduate students to become familiar with theories of public values and with political systems at the local, national, regional, and international levels. We also seek to instill the ability to think and analyze such phenomena in a critical way and to develop the necessary oral and written skills to convey those analyses to others. We seek to conduct high-quality research on issues across the entire political science curriculum and to disseminate that knowledge in leading books and journals and in other scholarly formats. Finally, we seek to externalize the knowledge of, and about, political and administrative systems and political processes for the well-being of the people of Iowa, the nation, and beyond. At the same time, the Department seeks feedback from its students and external communities to strengthen discovery and enrich learning.

## **Section 1. The Faculty**

### **Subsection A. Membership and Voting**

1. The regular Faculty is composed of term faculty holding multiple-year contracts, tenured, or tenure-eligible positions in the Department, including the Chair. Such individuals may hold joint appointments in other divisions of the University. In some instances the line for the appointment may appear in another budget. Other Faculty include Emeritus, Temporary, Visiting, Collaborator, Affiliate, and Courtesy appointments.
2. All regular Faculty have full voting rights. Restrictions on the Chair's voting rights apply in the case of tenure and promotion, as well as Faculty covered by Subsection C, as specified in the Department's Promotion and Tenure and Term Faculty Evaluation documents.
3. Faculty outside the Political Science Department may be recognized as affiliated upon approval of the Department as a whole. No departmental funds shall be involved in such appointments. Appointments for all ranks of affiliate faculty shall be for a term not to exceed five years, with the possibility of renewal. At any time the appointment may be terminated without cause. A peer performance review involving a faculty committee shall be done at time of renewal.
4. The minimum requirement for tenured and tenure-eligible faculty hires is a Ph.D. or equivalent. The minimum requirement for term faculty is a Master's degree.

### **Subsection B. Meetings of the Faculty**

1. Meetings of the Faculty will occur once per month at a time scheduled by the Chair. They can be held more frequently, when circumstances require such meetings.
2. If there is not enough business for a specific faculty meeting, the Chair may cancel the meeting. This decision can be overruled by any three of the regular faculty.
3. The Chair may call additional meetings. Faculty may initiate a call for a special meeting. The latter must be signed by at least one-third of the Faculty, excluding those officially on leave and must stipulate the matters to be considered at the meeting.
4. A quorum for either a regular or special meeting is 50 percent of the Faculty.
5. Minutes shall be kept at all regular meetings. The Chair will designate one tenured faculty member to record minutes at each meeting.

### **Subsection C. Powers**

1. The tenured and tenure-eligible Faculty have a major role in promotion and tenure actions, as well as in Faculty recruitment.
2. The specific policies of the Department regarding promotion and tenure are outlined in Article II of this document.

### **Subsection D. Committees**

1. The Department as a whole and its units shall have standing and ad hoc committees.
2. The standing committees are the Faculty Review Committee, the Graduate Committee, the Undergraduate Committee, the DEI (Diversity, Equity and Inclusion) Committee, and the Awards Committee.

3. The DEI Committee will include a voting student member, who will be named annually to the committee.
4. Committees will report to the Chair of the Department.
5. The Chair shall create ad hoc committees as necessary, defining their role making the appointments.

### **Subsection E. Faculty Rights and Obligations**

1. The Faculty is a community of scholars in which collegiality is of great importance. The Department should operate with as much openness as possible while respecting guarantees of confidentiality and the appropriate demands of personal privacy. Regular Faculty have a right to be fully informed about the activities of their Department.
2. In teaching, research, service, and outreach activities, Faculty are to meet all the standards of professional ethics.
3. Faculty are to comply with University regulations. Insofar as they have made a good faith effort to do so, they are entitled to expect the support of the Chair.
4. The Department follows the grievance procedure as outlined in the *Faculty Handbook*.

## **Section 2. Department Chair**

### **Subsection A. Selection, Term, and Review**

1. The Chair is appointed by the Dean of the College, after consultation with members of the regular Faculty and with the approval of the University administration and the Iowa Board of Regents. Department Faculty will be consulted and will have the opportunity to express their preferences in this matter.
2. The term of the Chair will be for a period of not less than three years or more than five years. Appointment to additional terms is possible under procedures established by the Department, the College, and/or the University.
3. The Chair will be subject to review every second year after selection or reappointment. A three-member committee consisting of tenured, tenure-eligible, and term Faculty members (elected by the Faculty) will review the Chair with respect to administration, scholarship, and teaching in accordance with University standards.

### **Subsection B. Powers**

1. The Chair is a member of the regular Faculty and is responsible for administering departmental affairs, including but not limited to making teaching assignments, assuring that Position Responsibility Statements are followed, and disbursing the departmental budget.
2. The Chair will convene and preside over meetings of the Department.
3. The Chair recommends salary adjustments for Faculty and staff in accordance with policies of the University, the College, and the Department.
4. The Chair may initiate disciplinary actions concerning Faculty in accordance with policies of the University, the College, and the Department.
5. The Chair may take those actions necessary and proper to execute the foregoing powers and to discharge the tasks assigned to the office by this Governance Document or the University administration.

6. The Chair will implement the Department annual review of all faculty and staff in accordance with the annual review policy.

### **Subsection C. Duties and Responsibilities**

1. The Chair shall be responsible for the performance of duties assigned by the University, the College, and the Department.
2. At regular intervals during the academic year, the Chair shall provide to regular Faculty a current financial report detailing expenditures, revenues, and encumbrances.
3. The Chair is responsible for counseling regular Faculty members concerning performance that may affect promotion and tenure, possible disciplinary actions, and salary adjustments.
4. If the Chair plans to be off campus (s)he shall designate a regular Faculty member to serve as interim Chair, to exercise such powers as University regulations permit.

### **Subsection D. Grievance Procedures**

Consonant with Section 9.1 of the Faculty Handbook, appeals may be filed by any Faculty member who believes she or he has been treated unfairly with respect to salary, promotion, tenure, academic concerns, reduction in force, or other matters related to employment. Faculty involved in each appeal may have their cases reviewed formally through the procedures developed by the Faculty Senate and approved by the administration. Appeals of administrative actions or actions to deny reappointment, promotion, or tenure should be based on grounds that improper procedures were followed, academic freedoms or constitutional rights were violated, policy was interpreted improperly, or arbitrary and capricious criteria were employed in recommending the action being appealed.

Appeals must be initiated no more than 45 B-base Faculty working days following the occurrence of the last event or events that are being appealed. Either party may refer the matter to an ad hoc departmental Grievance Mediation Panel, consisting of 1 tenured Faculty member selected by the Faculty member involved in the disagreement, 1 tenured Faculty member selected by the Department Chair, and 1 tenured Faculty member elected by the Faculty. The Faculty members selected by the 2 parties will be selected at the time the disagreement arises between those 2 parties. The Grievance Mediation Panel will review the materials that have been submitted by both parties, meet with both parties, deliberate on the issue, and deliver a written opinion within 2 months on how the disagreement should be resolved. Appeals beyond the Department level may occur either through higher administrative channels or through the Faculty Senate Committee on Appeals, as detailed in the Faculty Handbook. Faculty members may use either channel or both consecutively, but not simultaneously.

## **Section 3. Director of Graduate Education**

The Director of Graduate Education (DOGE) will be appointed by the Chair. He or she will chair the graduate committee. As chair of the committee, the DOGE is responsible for overseeing reviews of the graduate program and recommending/implementing necessary changes. Decisions of the Graduate Committee can be overruled by the full faculty in a department meeting. Furthermore, the DOGE will be responsible for identifying graduate student award winners, handling routine graduate curricular and policy questions overseeing student recruitment efforts, providing advising for graduate students who do not yet have a POS committee, and assisting the Chair with assignment of teaching assistants (with

final decisions in this area left to the chair). He or she is also the main contact person for prospective graduate students.

## **Section 4. Director of Undergraduate Education**

The Director of Undergraduate Education (DUGE) will be appointed by the Chair. He or she will chair the Undergraduate Committee. The DUGE is responsible for recommending and implementing necessary changes in the major and to identifying appropriate policy actions to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of our undergraduate curriculum. Decisions of the Undergraduate Committee can be overruled by the full faculty in a department meeting. The DUGE and the committee are responsible for identifying most undergraduate student award winners, handling routine curricular and policy questions for the undergraduate program, and addressing outcomes assessment for the Political Science major. Finally, the DUGE and the committee should discuss and make recommendations to the Department regarding ways to recruit and retain majors from among the “Open Option” cohort in LAS and from other sources.

## **Section 5. Annual Review**

All faculty members (tenured, tenure-eligible, term, whether full-time or part-time) will be evaluated annually (July 1 to June 30) for performance appraisal and development on the basis of their position responsibility statement. The evaluation is based on scholarship and contributions in teaching, research/creative activities, extension/professional practice, and institutional service as indicated in each individual’s PRS. Each faculty member’s overall performance shall be evaluated as either satisfactory or unsatisfactory. The annual evaluation will serve as a basis for determining merit salary increases.

The annual faculty evaluation process is the responsibility of the Department Chair, who will, no later than January 15, ask all faculty to document their research, teaching, service, and extension/professional practice on a form of his or her design. Failure by a faculty member to comply with that process will, except in extenuating circumstances, result in an unsatisfactory annual evaluation. For tenured faculty two consecutive unsatisfactory annual performance evaluations trigger a Post Tenure Review, and for all faculty two consecutive unsatisfactory annual performance evaluations may also result in a charge of unacceptable performance as defined in the Faculty Conduct Policy. Evaluation of faculty will be in accordance with their Position Responsibility Statement and their percentage of appointment. The Chair will meet individually with each faculty member. This annual evaluation meeting between the chair and the faculty member provides an opportunity for an exchange of ideas of benefit to the individual and the Department. The meeting includes a review of the faculty member’s PRS and any action plans from the previous post-tenure review or annual performance evaluation. After the meeting, the Chair will create a final report that both the Chair and the faculty member sign.

## **Section 6. Amendment**

Any three regular Faculty members may initiate an amendment to this Governance Document by submitting it to the Chair. No more than a week later, the Chair shall circulate the proposal to the regular Faculty, and place the proposal on the agenda for a meeting of the full Department to be held before the end of the academic term. Ballots will be circulated to the regular Faculty following the

meeting, which shall be due within one week. A three-fifths vote shall be sufficient to approve the amendment, providing that this constitutes at least a majority of the regular Faculty, not counting those officially on leave and off-campus.

## **Article II. Promotion and Tenure Policy for the Department of Political Science**

The Department of Political Science is committed to assuring due process to all its members in reaching decisions on promotion and tenure.

Consistent with Section 5.1.1.5 of the Faculty Handbook, performance evaluations of term, tenure-eligible, and tenured Faculty are based on their PRS and other activities that relate to Faculty appointments. The results of all reviews must be shared with the individual Faculty members. The PRS description itself should be general and include only the significant responsibilities of the Faculty member that are important in evaluating Faculty accomplishments in the promotion and tenure process or for advancement for term Faculty. The PRS shall not violate the Faculty member's academic freedom in teaching, in the selection of topics or methods of research, or in extension/professional practice. The PRS will be subject to regular review by the Faculty member and the Chair, and allow for flexibility in responsibilities over time and for the changing nature of Faculty appointments. The PRS cannot be changed unilaterally by either the Chair or the Faculty member.

For a newly hired Faculty member, the PRS will be signed and dated by both the new Faculty member and Chair, and will be maintained in the Faculty member's personnel file and in the Dean's office. This PRS should stand for the first 3 years of an initial appointment. Any changes in expectations for the tenure-eligible/tenured Faculty member must be made in consultation between the Chair and the Faculty member. When tenure is granted, the Faculty member and the Chair will review the details of the PRS and make any necessary changes.

At least every five years, as part of the annual review process, each tenured Faculty member will re-evaluate his or her PRS with the Chair. The PRS may be reviewed and/or changed more frequently, as part of the annual review process. Any changes in the statement must be made in consultation between the Chair and the tenured Faculty member and signed and dated by both parties, and will be maintained in each Faculty member's personnel file and in the Dean's office.

In the case of Faculty members who have appointments in two Departments (or a Department and a program), a PRS will be written by the Faculty member and the two Chairs and signed and dated by all three parties. Each Department and College involved will receive copies of those statements.

If one of the parties disagrees with a proposed change to the Faculty member's PRS, either party may refer the matter to the Department's PRS Mediation Panel, consisting of 1 tenured Faculty member selected by the Faculty member involved in the disagreement, 1 tenured Faculty member selected by the Chair, and 1 tenured Faculty member elected by the Faculty. The Faculty members selected by the 2 parties will be selected at the time the disagreement arises. The PRS Mediation Panel will review the materials that have been submitted by both parties, meet with both parties, deliberate on the issue, and deliver a written opinion within 2 months on how the disagreement should be resolved. If an agreement between the Faculty member and the Chair does not emerge within 10

working days, the matter will be forwarded by the party disagreeing with the proposed change to the Faculty member's College for further consideration and resolution. If the issue is not resolved at this level, the matter will be taken to the Dean of the College by the party disagreeing with the proposed change. During the time of this mediation process, the existing signed and dated PRS will remain in effect.

The Chair will have a PRS, written by the Chair and the Dean, describing the administrative and other departmental responsibilities of the position.

The following sets out the guidelines for assuring the above aspects of Article II. The appointment and preliminary evaluation of tenure-eligible (probationary) Faculty that follows carefully reflects College and University policy on these matters.

## **Section 1: Appointment and Preliminary Evaluation of Tenure-Eligible (Probationary) Faculty**

### **Subsection A: New Appointments**

A departmental search committee will be appointed by the Chair for all Faculty openings. The committee will review and identify candidates for interviews. The search committee and department will abide by university and college search committee requirements, including confidentiality. Any Department members with a familial or substantial financial relationship shall recuse themselves as having a potential conflict of interest. Subject to the approval of the Dean, candidates will be interviewed. All tenured or tenure-eligible faculty will vote among the candidates for making a job offer, subject to the approval of the Dean.

The majority of initial appointments will be "tenure-eligible" term appointments, most often at the rank of Assistant Professor. Assistant Professors will generally receive initial tenure-eligible term appointments for four years, with the possibility of renewal for another three years. The combined seven-year period is referred to as the full probationary period. Occasionally, initial appointments will be at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor without tenure. These initial tenure-eligible appointments will also be for a specified term, which will constitute the probationary period.

Some initial appointments in the Department will be at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor with tenure. Such appointments will have continuous contracts with all the responsibilities and privileges of tenured Faculty. Appointments to tenured positions are made only when consistent with the approved Notice of Vacancy and with the explicit approval of both the Dean and the Provost. Furthermore, all candidates for a tenured position must meet with both the Dean and the Provost or their designated representatives during the on-campus interview.

Most new Faculty in the Department are hired as Assistant Professors in tenure-eligible term appointments. The purpose of the full probationary period is to provide sufficient opportunity for the candidate to achieve the credentials required for promotion and tenure. The length of the full probationary period is specified in the Letter of Intent (LOI) at the time of the initial appointment. Unless prior work at another University is *formally* credited on the LOI, the full probationary period is seven years (the probationary period can be extended under some exceptional and documented

circumstances, as specified in the University's *Faculty Handbook*). This seven-year period is split into two contracts: the initial probationary contract, generally for four years, and the renewal probationary contract, generally for three additional years.

## **Subsection B: Preliminary Review of Probationary Faculty**

### **Part 1: Purpose of the Review**

The annual review of tenure-eligible faculty aims to gauge and monitor the progression of a candidate through the probationary period in terms of the criteria applicable to the eventual granting of promotion and tenure. These meetings are not to merely comment on the candidate's past record, but provide feedback on the standing of the candidate and give the tenured faculty the opportunity to provide guidance and advice about the faculty member's progress towards tenure. A positive evaluation, in this case, is meant to be suggestive that the candidate has performed appropriately for someone at their stage in the tenure process. It is not a guarantee that their eventual record will be rewarded with tenure. Similarly, an unfavorable evaluation does not imply that the candidate will not be tenured. It indicates that the current trajectory is likely to be insufficient.

The Department Chair, in consultation with a committee made up of approximately half the tenured faculty in a meeting, shall conduct first-, second-, fourth-, and fifth-year reviews of a less formal nature (in comparison to those for mid-term [third-year] and promotion and tenure [sixth-year]) of all tenure-eligible faculty members for purposes of judging satisfactory progress towards tenure. Tenured faculty members other than the Department Chair are expected to serve on this committee every other year. Tenured faculty who cannot serve because of a faculty professional development assignment or other leave will serve the following year. This evaluation will be based on the cumulative file of the annual review materials the untenured faculty submit as part of the annual review process. Prior to the meeting, the Chair shall solicit written evaluations from the consultative faculty prior to the faculty meeting. These comments will include separate comments about the faculty member's research, teaching, and service, as well as an opportunity to provide an overall assessment of the tenure-eligible faculty member's progress toward tenure.

Upon request of the candidate, the Department Chair, or one third of the tenured faculty, a vote on satisfactory/unsatisfactory progress toward tenure shall be taken and transmitted. Votes on satisfactory progress will normally take place for 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 5th year reviews.

Tenure-eligible faculty members should be informed as soon as possible after the meeting of the faculty vote. A written evaluation by the Chair summarizing the content of the meeting shall be given to the candidate as soon as possible, but no later than 30 days after the faculty meeting.

The annual review of tenure-eligible faculty aims to gauge and monitor the progression of a candidate through the probationary period in terms of the criteria applicable to the eventual granting of promotion and tenure. These meetings are not to merely comment on the candidate's past record, but provide feedback on the standing of the candidate and give the tenured faculty the opportunity to provide guidance and advice about the faculty member's progress towards tenure. A positive evaluation, in this case, is meant to be suggestive that the candidate has performed appropriately for someone at their stage in the tenure process. It is not a guarantee that their eventual record will be



rewarded with tenure. Similarly, an unfavorable evaluation does not imply that the candidate will not be tenured.

In addition to annual written reviews from the Department Chair and first-, second-, fourth-, and fifth-year reviews by the Department's tenured faculty, probationary faculty members will be formally reviewed in the penultimate year of their initial probationary contract (generally the third year of the initial four-year probationary appointment). One purpose of this review is to provide constructive and developmental feedback to probationary faculty members. A second purpose is to inform the decision of whether or not to reappoint the faculty member for the second term of his or her probationary period; consequently, this review is often referred to as the contract-renewal or preliminary review. Renewal of the probationary contract is dependent on a positive preliminary review.

If the outcome of the preliminary review is negative, the faculty member will be notified by May 15 in his or her penultimate year of the initial probationary contract that his or her contract will not be renewed. This action would define the upcoming and last year of the initial appointment as the terminal year of appointment at Iowa State University. If the outcome of the preliminary review is positive, the faculty member will be awarded a contract for a second probationary term (generally three years) that will extend to the end of the full probationary period. Faculty members whose probationary contracts are renewed will receive a promotion and tenure review in the penultimate year of this second contract. A favorable promotion and tenure review would result in a new continuous contract as a tenured faculty member, and an unfavorable review would result in the final year of the second probationary contract becoming the terminal year of appointment at Iowa State University.

## **Part 2: Length of Contracts**

The exact length of first-term and second-term probationary contracts and the timing of the preliminary review vary somewhat depending on whether or not the Faculty member is formally credited for work at prior universities, as documented on the LOI. The following subsections describe the lengths of probationary contracts and the timing of the preliminary review given different amounts of time formally credited on the LOI.

The initial probationary contract for new tenure-eligible Assistant Professors who do not formally receive credit for prior work at another University will be for four years. These probationary Faculty members will be formally reviewed in the third year of their initial four-year probationary contract. If the outcome of this review is negative, the Faculty member will be notified by May 15 in their third year of the initial probationary contract that their contract will not be renewed. This action would define the upcoming fourth year of the initial appointment as the terminal year of appointment at Iowa State University. If the outcome of the preliminary review is positive, the Faculty member will be awarded a contract for a second probationary period of three years. The Faculty member would receive a promotion and tenure review in the second year of the second probationary contract (i.e., the sixth year at ISU). A favorable promotion and tenure review would result in a new continuous contract as a tenured Faculty member, and an unfavorable review would result in the final year of the second probationary contract (i.e., the seventh year at ISU) becoming the terminal year of appointment at Iowa State University.

For Faculty members who formally receive one year of credit for prior work at other universities, the initial probationary period will be for four years and the contract renewal review will occur during their third year of employment at ISU. If the outcome of this review is negative, the Faculty member will be notified by May 15 in his or her third year of service that the initial probationary contract will not be renewed. This action would define the upcoming fourth year of the initial appointment as the terminal year of appointment at Iowa State University. This is exactly the same time line as for Faculty not receiving credit for prior work. The one year of credit is given in the second term of the probationary period. Consequently, Faculty members who receive one year of credit and have a favorable preliminary review will receive a two-year contract for the second term of their probationary period, reflecting the one year of credit on the tenure clock that they received. The promotion and tenure review for these Faculty members will occur during their fifth year at ISU. A favorable promotion and tenure review would result in a new continuous contract as a tenured Faculty member, and an unfavorable review would result in the final year of the second probationary contract (sixth year at ISU) becoming the terminal year of appointment at Iowa State University.

For Faculty members who formally receive two years of credit for prior work at other universities, the initial probationary period will be for three years and the contract renewal review will occur during their second year of employment at ISU. The research programs of Faculty members given two years of credit will be sufficiently mature to justify review in the second year of employment at ISU. If the outcome of this review is negative, the Faculty member will be notified by May 15 in his or her second year of service that the initial probationary contract will not be renewed. This action would define the upcoming third year of the initial appointment as the terminal year of appointment at Iowa State University. For these Faculty members, a favorable preliminary review will result in a two-year contract for the second term of their probationary period. The promotion and tenure review for these Faculty members will occur during their fourth year at ISU. A favorable promotion and tenure review would result in a new continuous contract as a tenured Faculty member, and an unfavorable review would result in the final year of the second probationary contract (i.e., the fifth year at ISU) becoming the terminal year of appointment at Iowa State University.

Faculty members who receive three or more years of credit for prior work at other universities will receive one contract for the entire probationary period, and there will be no preliminary/contract renewal review. The promotion and tenure review for these Faculty members will occur in the penultimate year of their single contract for the entire probationary period. A favorable promotion and tenure review would result in a new continuous contract as a tenured Faculty member, and an unfavorable review would result in the final year of the probationary contract becoming the terminal year of appointment at Iowa State University.

### **Part 3: Evaluation Criteria for Preliminary Reviews**

Preliminary reviews and decisions about contract renewal are based primarily on performance in scholarship and in any assigned position responsibilities in teaching, research/creative activities, extension/professional practice, and/or institutional service. A Faculty member is expected to perform satisfactorily in all areas of professional activity and to uphold the values and follow the guidelines of professional ethics from the University and the discipline. In addition, a Faculty member is expected to establish a foundation and trajectory in scholarship during the first probationary period that, if

continued, should lead to documented excellence in scholarship at the time of the promotion and tenure review.

A key tool in the preliminary review process is the position responsibility statement (PRS), which describes the individual's current position responsibilities and activities in the following areas: (1) teaching, (2) research/creative activities, (3) extension/professional practice, and (4) institutional service. This statement is used by all evaluators to interpret the extent, balance, and scope of the Faculty member's scholarly achievements. The PRS should reflect any commitments to interdisciplinary programs, and the preliminary evaluation should assess the full range of the Faculty member's contributions to the University, including contributions to interdisciplinary programs.

Preliminary reviews are initiated in the Department. Generally, the processes for preliminary reviews parallel those for promotion and tenure reviews; however, external referees are *not* solicited or used for preliminary reviews. The full eligible Faculty vote on the departmental recommendation. For preliminary reviews, the eligible Faculty is comprised of all tenured Faculty members in the Department, acting as a committee of the whole. Any Department members with a familial or substantial financial relationship shall recuse themselves as having a potential conflict of interest. The Department Chair makes a separate administrative recommendation, and the recommendations of the Department and the Department Chair are forwarded to the College. To avoid undue or unfair influence, each eligible Faculty member may vote on a preliminary review case only once. Specifically, under this policy: (1) If a Faculty member votes on a preliminary review decision, that Faculty member may not vote again on the same decision at the departmental, College, or other levels. (2) Since the Chair of the Department independently evaluates preliminary review decisions, he or she may not also vote on the decision at the departmental Faculty, College, or other levels. (3) Administrators participating in a preliminary decision may only participate at one level and are allowed to vote only once on the decision, which would be at the level appropriate for their administrative rank.

The continued growth and well-being of the Department, College, and University require that Faculty members faithfully and competently execute their position responsibilities. Consequently, satisfactory performance in all position responsibilities, as defined in a Faculty member's PRS, is a requirement for contract renewal. All Faculty members should have responsibilities in the area of institutional service. Indeed, the principle of Faculty governance rests squarely on the expectation for Faculty participation on Department, College, and/or University committees, task forces, etc. For tenure-eligible Faculty, institutional service will most likely occur at the Department level. Nearly all tenured and tenure-eligible Faculty members in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences have responsibilities for research and creative activities that further discovery and generation of new knowledge in the College and University. Most Faculty members also have significant teaching responsibilities, which are critical for the University to fulfill its teaching mission. Finally, some Faculty members also have extension/professional practice responsibilities, consistent with the University's "science with practice" orientation and its land-grant University mission.

The following text outlines expectations for the demonstration and evaluation of satisfactory performance within each domain of position responsibilities for the preliminary review. Required documentation within each area of position responsibilities is specified in the LAS Preliminary Review Dossier Template.

## **Scholarship**

Nearly all tenured or tenure-eligible faculty members are expected to engage in research activities that make original contributions to their chosen area of specialization. All faculty with research responsibilities in their PRS are expected to be fully engaged in the discovery/creativity process as evidenced by production of research/creative products that are respected by their peers and through the supervision of student research/creative work. Faculty with position responsibilities in research activities are also expected to make efforts to secure external funding to support their research.

### **Expectations for Scholarship**

Contract renewal decisions are based primarily on evidence of a foundation and trajectory in scholarship that would predict the achievement of excellence in scholarship by the time of the promotion and tenure review. Scholarship may occur in the areas of teaching, research activities, and/or extension/professional practice. Although the nature and evidence of scholarship varies somewhat across these scholarly domains, there are at least three common features of all types of scholarship. A critical feature of all scholarship is that it results in products, often referred to as intellectual property, that are shared with appropriate audiences as journal articles, book chapters, books, exhibits, software programs, musical scores, professional presentations, etc. A second important feature of all scholarship is that it is subject to peer review, a critical evaluation of the product by those qualified to judge it. Finally, scholarship demonstrates a solid foundation in one's field and original contributions to that field.

Evaluation of a candidate's scholarship should be based on the candidate's performance relative to his or her PRS and the standards and goals of the Department. However, in all cases, Department, College, and University minimum expectations for scholarship must be met or exceeded.

The following sub-sections outline expectations for the demonstration and evaluation of scholarship performed substantially at ISU within each professional domain (this would include books and other major works based on the dissertation but written at ISU). Required documentation within each area of scholarship is specified in the LAS Preliminary Review Dossier Template.

### **Scholarship of Research Activities**

Faculty members who engage in research activities are expected to make original contributions to discovery/creativity in their chosen area of specialization, and to disseminate those contributions through appropriate methods. In Political Science, evidence of research primarily consists of publications in refereed journals, scholarly books, monographs, external funding to support research, and chapters in scholarly books.

Other forms of dissemination of research results include oral presentations of such work to the academic community at other universities and at regional, national, and international meetings and seminars. Invited lectures and papers, as well as requests to review and referee the scholarly work of others, are evidence of the individual's local, regional, national, and international reputations. Additional indicators of the quality of the research or creative activity may include reviews of the candidate's papers, books, performances and exhibitions, and summary figures showing the extent of

citations. Participation in technical, professional, or scholarly societies and public service may also involve scholarship in the area of research or creative activity under some circumstances. The Department is expected not only to summarize the candidate's contributions to research and creative scholarship, but to also address the quality and impact of this work.

### **Scholarship of Teaching and Learning**

Nearly all Faculty members have teaching and advising responsibilities, and some Faculty members will also produce scholarship in the area of teaching and advising. Scholarship of teaching focuses on the discovery of knowledge about teaching and learning in higher education. Scholarship of teaching generates products that are appropriately shared with professional audiences, and it must be held to the same standards of rigor, relevance, peer review, and dissemination as other forms of disciplinary research and creative activity. Scholarship of teaching products often include research on teaching, learning, and outcomes assessment or program evaluation; textbooks and other curricular materials; and innovative teaching methods that have been appropriately evaluated. The most common forms of dissemination for scholarship of teaching would be through refereed journals, scholarly books and chapters, textbooks and chapters, and professional presentations and workshops. Invited lectures and papers, as well as requests to review and referee the teaching scholarship of others, are evidence of the individual's local, regional, national, and international reputation. Additional indicators of the quality of teaching scholarship may include reviews and/or adoptions of the candidate's research, curricular materials, and textbooks, as well as summary data showing the extent of citations. Participation in technical, professional, or scholarly societies and public service may also involve scholarship of teaching under some circumstances. The Department is expected not only to summarize the candidate's contributions to the scholarship of teaching, but also to address the quality and impact of this work.

### **Extension or Professional Practice**

Some tenured or tenure-eligible faculty members may have position responsibilities in extension/professional practice. These Faculty members often have a portion of their appointment in extension or have significant responsibilities to utilize their professional expertise to help improve the knowledge and skills of clients outside the University, or the environment in which their clients live and work. Examples of these activities include teaching extension courses; preparing informational and instructional materials; conducting workshops and conferences; consulting with public and private groups; acquiring, organizing, and interpreting information resources; engaging in clinical and diagnostic practice; and participating in activities that involve professional expertise for appropriate technical and professional associations. These activities may be local, regional, national, or international in scope.

A departmental evaluation of competence in extension/professional practice should include an assessment of the quantity and quality of the candidate's extension and/or professional practice activities. Documentation supporting a departmental evaluation of a candidate's contributions in this area should include a description of the activities, the materials relevant to these activities, and a detailed assessment of the quality of the contributions and the level of professional expertise and impact demonstrated by the candidate.

### **Teaching**

Teaching and advising are scholarly and dynamic endeavors that cover a broad range of activities, and most Faculty members have significant teaching and advising responsibilities. For these Faculty members, the quality of their teaching and advising is a major factor in evaluating their overall performance in position responsibilities.

## **Evaluation of Teaching**

The Department is expected to utilize an appropriate method of general and continuing review of the teaching effectiveness of its Faculty members. Student evaluations of instructors and peer evaluations of instructors, based on classroom observations, must be part of the evaluation of teaching in all instances, but student evaluations of teaching cannot be the only source of the evaluation. Similarly, evaluation of the candidate's advising performance should be based on parallel methods of review. In addition, contributions to the curriculum (e.g., development of new courses, new materials for courses, etc.) should also be noted. A negative evaluation of teaching based on student evaluations of teaching can only occur if the Faculty member's evaluation scores are consistently statistically significantly below the mean of comparable courses.

As described in the LAS Preliminary Review Dossier Template, the Department is expected not only to summarize its evaluation of the candidate's teaching performance but also to submit documentation supporting the evaluation. This documentation should include evidence of student learning, including student and peer evaluations of teaching effectiveness, and information relevant to curricular development. The methods used to evaluate teaching effectiveness should be documented and compared to departmental norms. When possible, these comparisons should include statistical evidence of deviations from the Department averages.

## **Institutional Service**

While service contributions cannot be the sole basis for a promotion and/or tenure recommendation, every Faculty member is expected to be involved in institutional service, and each promotion and tenure recommendation must provide evidence of such contributions. The principle of Faculty governance rests squarely on the expectation for Faculty participation on Department, College, and/or University committees, task forces, etc.

Documentation should include an enumeration of Department, College, and University committee memberships and chairships, as well as administrative assignments. It is critical that an assessment of the quality as well as the quantity of the service activities of a candidate be included in the departmental evaluation and recommendation. Although all Faculty members should have some institutional service assignments, it is understood that the service commitments of probationary Faculty in their first term will be modest and occur primarily at the departmental level.

## **Extension and/or Professional Practice**

Because Iowa State University is a land-grant University with a focus on science with practice, some Faculty are actively engaged in the scholarship of extension/professional practice. Faculty who do not have this as part of the PRS will not be evaluated based on extension/professional practice. Scholarship of extension/professional practice focuses on the discovery of knowledge that informs practitioners in Political Science, has direct applications to policy or practice in the public or private

sectors of the community, and/or informs methods for developing and optimally distributing and evaluating methods of bringing information to the public. Scholarship of extension/professional practice generates products that are appropriately shared with professional and public audiences. Scholarship of extension/professional practice must be held to the same standards of rigor, relevance, peer review, and dissemination as other forms of disciplinary research and creative activity. Scholarship of extension/professional practice products often include research on applications of science to public policy and everyday problems in the community, development of new public or commercial products, and development of new methods for the exchange of information with the community. Often, a program evaluation component is associated with such products. The most common forms of dissemination for scholarship of extension/professional practice would be through refereed journals; scholarly books and chapters; professional presentations and workshops; and expert testimony and technical reports for judicial, public, and/or private entities. Invited lectures and papers, as well as requests to review and referee the extension/professional practice scholarship of others, are evidence of the individual's local, regional, national, and international reputation. Additional indicators of the quality of extension/professional practice scholarship may include reviews and/or adoptions of the candidate's research, public policy recommendations, interviews with the news media about the faculty member's professional expertise, publications in research related media outlets, extension or workshop materials, and books, as well as summary data showing the extent of citations. Participation in technical, professional, or scholarly societies and public service may also involve scholarship of extension/professional practice under some circumstances. The Department is expected not only to summarize the candidate's contributions to the scholarship of extension/professional practice, but to also address the quality and impact of this work. Unlike promotion and tenure reviews, preliminary reviews should *not* solicit or use external referees.

#### **Part 4: Informing Candidates of the Procedures**

Candidates should be made aware of:

- The process under which a review may be postponed based on exceptional and documented circumstances as described below.
- The composition of any other Department committees that may be involved in the review process, including any quorum and voting requirements.
- The role of the Department Chair in the Department's preliminary review process.
- The procedures established to ensure that there is only one vote for each eligible Faculty member at the Department level.
- The definition of conflict of interest operative in departmental review.
- The procedures to be followed by the departmental review committee and related committees in conducting the reviews.
- The types and sources of information that the departmental review committee will consider in conducting its review, the same procedures as for P&T except outside letters.
- The means by which persons being considered submit information and documentation for the review process at the departmental level as described in the complete LAS Template.
- The definition of the factual information in the dossier subject to review by the Faculty member before it is advanced from the Department as described in the LAS Template and supporting material.
- The procedures for handling discussions and votes in instances of multiple candidates for promotion and/or tenure.

- The procedures for reviewing and modifying the departmental document. See amendment procedures earlier.
- The procedures for communicating review results in accord with College procedure.

## **Part 5: Departmental and Department Chair Recommendations**

The departmental review committee reports the departmental recommendation to the Department Chair in writing, including all formal votes. The Department Chair writes a separate letter of recommendation that may or may not agree with the departmental recommendation, and the departmental review committee shall be informed of the Department Chair's recommendation. The Department Chair will forward his or her recommendation and rationale to the College, along with the departmental recommendation and report, for all preliminary reviews.

Recommendations will generally fall into one of the following three categories:

1. Renew contract for second probationary term with no reservations or concerns.
2. Renew contract for second probationary term with reservations and identify areas requiring remediation.
3. Do not renew the contract for a second probationary term, with reasons specified.

## **Part 6: Supporting Documentation for Departmental Recommendations**

For purposes of review of departmental and Department Chair recommendations at the College and University levels, the current LAS Preliminary Review Dossier Template, which is available on the College's web site or by request, must be used in constructing preliminary review dossiers. Use of this template will ensure that critical information is included and that the dossier conforms to College and University expectations.

## **Part 7: College Review**

Based on a thorough review of the departmental recommendation, Department Chair recommendation, and all supporting documentation, the Dean will make a decision about contract renewal. This decision may or may not agree with the recommendations from the Department and the Department Chair. The Dean will communicate his or her decision to the Department Chair in writing. If the Dean's decision differs from the recommendations from the Department and Chair, his or her rationale for the different judgment will be included in the written notification to the Chair.

## **Part 8: Informing the Candidates**

Each candidate for contract renewal will be given the opportunity to review the factual information in the report being forwarded to the College (Tabs 1 and 2 of the Preliminary Review Dossier), and to inform the Chair of any ways in which he or she believes this information to be incomplete or inaccurate. The Chair shall inform each candidate in writing about the recommendations that will be forwarded to the College within one week of the review meeting and *before* the recommendations are actually submitted. Faculty members who are not being recommended for renewal by either the Department or the Department Chair, or both, shall be informed in writing of the reasons. This information should be presented in a constructive manner.



After receiving the Dean’s decision, the Chair will write a letter to the Faculty member communicating the outcome of the preliminary review as quickly as possible. The letter will clearly state the decision regarding contract renewal and the reasons for that decision. If the contract will be renewed, the letter will also provide suggestions for improvement in preparation for the later promotion and tenure review. The Dean will be copied on this letter. For contract renewals, a new Letter of Intent for the second term of the probationary period will be attached to the copy of the Chair’s letter that is forwarded to the College. For negative decisions, the Chair’s letter will clearly communicate that the contract will not be renewed and that the remaining year on the active contract will be the candidate’s last year of employment at ISU. The Chair will also inform the eligible voting Faculty of the outcome of the review.

## **Part 9: Materials Forwarded by the College to the Provost**

The Dean will communicate the review decision and forward to the Provost the complete Preliminary Review Dossier and a copy of the letter from the Chair to the candidate communicating the outcome of the review to the candidate.

## **Part 10: Timeline for Review Actions**

<i>Deadline</i>	<i>Action</i>
Prior to March 15	Candidate submits his or her portfolio
Prior to April 15	Department conducts preliminary review of candidate according to Department, College, and University policy, and communicates the departmental and Chair’s recommendations to the candidate.
April 15	Departmental recommendation, Chair’s recommendation, and complete dossier are submitted to the Dean.
May 5	Dean communicates decision to Chair.
May 15	Department Chair communicates outcome of review to candidate, copying Dean.
June 1	Required materials are forwarded to the Provost.

## **Subsection C: Evaluation of Core Faculty in Interdisciplinary Programs**

Evaluations of Faculty who have formal responsibilities and salary in both an interdisciplinary program and an academic tenure-granting Department require additional considerations and actions to ensure that evaluations fairly and appropriately encompass all of the Faculty member’s contributions. Such Faculty members are hereafter referred to as “Core Faculty.” This addendum addresses preliminary/contract renewal procedures for Core Faculty. Procedures governing the hiring, mentoring, annual review, and promotion and tenure review procedures for Core Faculty members are provided in “Policies and Procedures on the Governance of Interdisciplinary Programs with Core Faculty in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences,” a document that is available on the College’s web site or by request.

Core Faculty members of an interdisciplinary program are responsible for the day-to-day operation of the program, have position responsibility statements that reflect a specific contractual level of obligation to and participation in the program, and have budgeted salaries that are divided by percentage between an interdisciplinary program and a tenure-granting Department. The relevant programs include, for example, the Ethnic Studies Programs in the Center for American Intercultural Studies, the Women’s Studies Program, and the Human Computer Interaction Program.

Faculty members employed at ISU may become Core Faculty and acquire co-appointments (core memberships) in an interdisciplinary program by obtaining permission from the Department and the program. Any change in Faculty status, either into or out of a program, would require agreement by the Faculty member, the program, and the Department, and would be reflected in the PRS and in the budgeted salary.

Preliminary/contract renewal reviews will be overseen by a review committee that is jointly appointed by the Department and the program. The program and the Department will agree to equitable representation of each unit on the review committee. The review committee's recommendation will be submitted to the Department Chair and to the program director to be used in accordance with the established procedures of each. The Chair and the program director will also make separate administrative recommendations, or they may choose to submit a joint administrative recommendation. The review committee recommendation and the administrative recommendation(s) regarding contract renewal and supporting documentation will be forwarded to the College.

## **Section 2: Promotion and Tenure**

### **Subsection 1: Overview**

As stated in the University policy on promotion and tenure, evaluation of a Faculty member for promotion and/or tenure is based primarily on evidence of scholarship in the Faculty member's teaching, research/creative activities, and/or extension/professional practice. Promotion to Associate Professor with tenure requires excellence in scholarship that establishes the person as a significant contributor to his or her field with potential for national distinction, as demonstrated by the candidate's quantity and quality of scholarship, trajectory of scholarship, and evidence of increasing national visibility. Promotion to Full Professor requires national distinction in scholarship, as documented by the candidate's record of scholarship and wide recognition for outstanding contributions to the field.

Faculty members are also evaluated in all areas of assigned responsibilities, including institutional service. Effectiveness in all areas of position responsibilities and behavior that is consistent with the values, guidelines, and professional ethics of the University and the candidate's discipline are required for promotion to any rank. In addition, satisfactory institutional service is required for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, and significant institutional service is required for promotion to Full Professor. Influence on the intellectual life of the University as an institution can be negative as well as positive. A member of the Faculty may be an impediment to the University's performance of its intellectual functions, quite apart from their own performance as a researcher or teacher. All members of the Faculty should therefore possess the requisite "academic citizenship," meaning that they will contribute what they can to the intellectual life of the University and that they will abstain from deliberate disruption of the regular operations of the University.

### **Subsection 2: Criteria for Evaluation**

#### **Part 1: PRS**

A key tool in evaluating a candidate for tenure and promotion is the PRS, which describes the individual Faculty member's responsibilities and activities in the following areas: (1) research/creative activities, (2) teaching (3) extension/professional practices, and (4) institutional service. This statement is used by all evaluators to interpret the extent, balance and scope of the Faculty member's scholarly

achievements. The PRS should reflect any commitments to interdisciplinary programs and the P&T evaluation should assess the full range of the Faculty member's contributions to the University, including contributions to interdisciplinary programs. The following discussion specifies the meaning of areas identified here as they apply to the Faculty within the Department of Political Science who are seeking promotion and/or tenure.

## **Part 2: Scholarship in Political Science**

Scholarship in Political Science shall consist of research and creative activity that produces new knowledge that is communicated to peers and wider audiences, and that has been reviewed and evaluated by peers beyond the University setting. Such scholarship normally takes the form of refereed articles, book chapters, and books that are disseminated through channels appropriate for the profession as a whole or the subfield of the Faculty member under review. Secondarily, presentations at professional conferences, talks to professional associations, and other scholarly speeches will also be considered. The number of publications necessary for promotion or promotion with tenure cannot be specified, but evidence of a research program that goes well beyond the dissertation research will generally be required. In establishing the corpus of the scholarly product, the emphasis shall be on its critical evaluation by professional peers, including evaluators external to the University. In the case of collaborative research on the part of the Faculty member under consideration for promotion or tenure, the role of the Faculty member in such work must be specified for the evaluative process.

## **Part 3: Teaching**

Teaching in Political Science normally involves regular on-campus, classroom instruction, but it may also involve the teaching of distance education and continuing education courses. In addition, Faculty may be involved in other activities associated with the teaching function, including serving or directing master's or doctoral committees, directing research at the graduate or undergraduate level, and developing new forms of pedagogy. In evaluating teaching, the Department is concerned with attitudes toward teaching and students' knowledge of the field of interest, effectiveness in presentation of course material, coherence of course organization, and validity of grading and evaluation procedures. Evidence for these indicators will come from student evaluations, course syllabi, a teaching portfolio, and peer visits. A negative evaluation of teaching based on student evaluations of teaching can only occur if the Faculty member's evaluation scores are consistently statistically significantly below the mean of comparable courses. The Faculty member shall be responsible for compiling and submitting the materials that he or she believes best represents the quality of his/her teaching performance.

## **Part 4: Service in Political Science**

Service refers to extension/outreach, institutional service, and service to the discipline.

Extension/outreach or community-based service is consistent with the land grant mission of Iowa State University and includes those activities that involve sharing knowledge with the citizens of Iowa, the nation, and nonacademic clientele around the world. These activities may take a variety of forms including conducting workshops, consulting with clients, and developing important resources. Although all Faculty members may identify extension activities as an element of evaluation, some Faculty members have been assigned special responsibilities in this area and therefore it may be their

primary area of evaluation. These Faculty shall identify and make available to the Department outside evaluators who speak to the quality of their performance. Similarly, peer-reviewed and applied publications, appropriate to the clientele audience, shall also serve as indicators of performance. In accordance with University policy, the evaluation of all activities and scholarship in this area shall be judged by the “breadth, depth, and duration of influence and use” of materials, by “public appreciation and benefit,” and by “applicability or adoption” of materials by others.

Institutional service refers to those activities expected of all Faculty members in participating in departmental governance, serving on departmental, College, and University committees, and carrying out administrative duties. The Department expects all Faculty to provide significant service every year (when not on leave).

Service to the discipline includes contributions to the profession. Activities in this area include, but are not limited to, serving as an editor, a referee, a representative on an association committee, an association officer, and a committee member on an advisory committee.

### **Subsection 3: Promotion**

Promotion in academic rank is awarded on the basis of achievements appropriate to the advanced rank as noted at the beginning of the section. Satisfactory performance at one rank is not a sufficient basis for promotion; such performance must be accompanied by growth of the individual to the performance level of the higher rank. The level of the performance sufficient to justify tenure will correspond to that expected for the rank of Associate Professor, and the granting of tenure will ordinarily accompany promotion to that rank.

An individual recommended for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor typically will be in the sixth year of the probationary period, and an individual recommended for promotion to the rank of Full Professor typically will have spent five or more years at the rank of Associate Professor. Such periods of time in rank are necessary for most Faculty members to demonstrate that the requirements for promotion to the higher rank have been met, but do not preclude earlier promotions. There is no minimum length of time in a rank required prior to promotion.

### **Subsection 4: Delay of Tenure Evaluation**

In accordance with Section E.2.1.4 of the *Faculty Handbook*, the Department recognizes that, on occasion, special circumstances may occur that interfere significantly with the Faculty member’s opportunity to develop the qualifications necessary for tenure in the usual time allowed. A Faculty member may request an extension of the probationary period based upon such circumstances. The request for an extension should be submitted in writing to the Chair, the Dean of the College, and the Provost as soon as possible, but no later than April 1 before the academic year in which the third-year review or tenure review is scheduled to be conducted. Requests should explain clearly the reasons for granting an extension of the probationary period and will be acted upon promptly. Requests for extension due to the birth of a child or the adoption of a child under age 5 will be submitted to and approved by the Chair, Dean, and Provost. The Chair, Dean, and Provost must approve requests based on other circumstances. If the Faculty member requests an extension, the Faculty member must acknowledge that tenure cannot be claimed on the basis that the total length of employment by then has extended beyond 7 years. A Faculty member may be granted only 2 1-year extensions during the probationary period. Scholarship accomplished by a tenure-eligible Faculty member during an

extension period shall be counted as part of a candidate's record. Standards regarding what constitutes a record deserving of tenure shall not be raised to adjust for any granted extension.

Circumstances accepted by Iowa State University for extension of the tenure clock include:

- birth of a child;
- adoption of a child under the age of 5;
- significant responsibilities of special medical or living assistance related to the dependent care of a spouse, domestic partner, mother, father, sister, brother, daughter, son, grandparent, grandchild, mother-in-law, father-in-law, sister-in-law, brother-in-law, daughter-in-law, son-in-law, grandparent-in-law, grandchild-in-law, or corresponding relatives of the employee's partner, other persons for whom the employee is legally responsible, and anyone who stood *in loco parentis* to the employee as a child;
- medical condition of the Faculty member;
- major shift in the departmental mission or in the Faculty member's PRS; and
- part-time appointment (but not beyond 11 years of service, with mandatory tenure review no later than year 10).

## **Subsection 5: Evaluation Guidelines and Procedures**

While the exact mechanisms for evaluating a Faculty member with the foregoing standards must be somewhat flexible to allow for the diversity of individual cases, the general procedures to be followed should be clear, fair, and consistent for all departmental candidates. Thus, the following procedures outline how the promotion and/or tenure decisions will be made within the Department of Political Science focusing on the schedule of such actions, the material required from the candidates, the responsibilities of departmental Faculty, the decision unit for different candidacies, and the voting arrangements and reporting by the Department.

### **Part 1. Schedule and General Guidelines**

Generally, promotion and tenure cases will adhere to the calendar outlined below, although the precise dates may vary slightly from case to case. If the schedule is changed substantially, the Chair will immediately inform the Faculty and explain the reasons for the modifications.

Every spring, the Chair will review the personnel files to determine whether or not the length of service of any Faculty member requires that a personnel decision be made during the next academic year. By February 15 the Chair will inform the Faculty of the cases that will need to be decided and will invite all Faculty members to suggest additional people, including themselves, to be considered for promotion or tenure. Faculty members may have their names removed from consideration without prejudice if the rules do not require that a decision be made during the next academic year. By March 1, the Chair will provide the Faculty with a final list of all of the cases that will be considered in the following year. At this time, the Chair will meet with each of the candidates to explain the personnel procedures. The Chair will appoint a committee consisting as far as possible of Faculty in a candidate's field to suggest the names of possible external reviewers. The Chair will inform the candidate and

committee of current best practices recommended by the Dean and Provost regarding criteria for external reviewers. By April 1, the Chair will receive two lists of potential outside reviewers for each candidate, one from the Committee and one from the candidate. Each Committee will be tailored as far as possible to reflect the specific teaching, research, and service interests of the candidate in accordance with the PRS. Letters will be solicited from external reviewers in the candidate's field, and Department recommendations will take account of the criteria generally used in the candidate's major field. The candidate may provide the Chair with reasons for excluding certain people as potential outsider reviewers. If any of these names are on the list from the Committee, the Chair will decide whether or not to solicit reviews from these people.

Over the summer months, the Chair will send letters to the names on the lists inquiring whether or not they will serve as evaluators. The Chair will contact and obtain the outside evaluators in the order they appear on the two lists. The chair may skip a name on either list if doing so is necessary to conform to the best practices recommended by the Dean and Provost that were articulated to the candidate and faculty. If a potential evaluator from the list refuses to serve, the Chair will contact the next evaluator on the list. If necessary, the Chair shall contact the Committee or the candidate to obtain further names. In all, at least five, and no more than six, evaluations must be received, at least half coming from persons on the Committee's list.

By May 31, the candidate will provide the Chair with the relevant materials to send to the evaluators. In early June, the materials will be mailed to the evaluators and be made available to the Department for review. The evaluators will be required to respond by October 1. The candidate's outside letters will be made available to the Faculty evaluating the candidate no later than October 15. No later than the last week of the fall semester before Thanksgiving Break, the Faculty shall meet to consider the personnel cases for that year and submit the departmental report to the Chair.

## **Part 2. Responsibilities of the Candidate**

The candidate under consideration for promotion and/or tenure shall have the responsibility for developing a reading packet for review by the appropriate unit within the Department. The candidate is free to include those materials that will most appropriately convey his or her activities in the areas of research, teaching, and service. These materials ordinarily would include, but are not restricted to, a vita, reprints of articles, copies of books, copies of papers accepted or under review, letters indicating the awarding of grants, outside assessments of research and scholarship, list of courses taught in the Department, course evaluations, course syllabi, and evidence of service to the Department, College, University, and profession. In addition, the candidate is encouraged to include other materials that would produce a full and fair evaluation of his or her academic performance. The candidate may add relevant materials to the packet at any time.

As part of this packet, the candidate shall also be required to prepare brief statements outlining how he or she has demonstrated competence in the three areas of teaching, research, and service. In the area of teaching the candidate's statement should outline the teaching philosophy guiding his or her work and explain how that philosophy is evident in the courses taught and other teaching activities at ISU. In the area of research, the candidate's statement should outline his or her general and specific areas of research and explain the contribution the candidate is making to the profession. In the area of

service, the candidate's statement should outline the kinds of activities undertaken and how that service contributes to the mission of the Department, College, University, and profession.

When the candidate's packet becomes available, it shall be the responsibility of those in the appropriate decision unit to read, review, and evaluate the file. Failure to do so shall be considered a serious violation of a departmental professional obligation.

### **Part 3. Decision Unit Meeting and Voting Procedures**

The Chair shall set a meeting time to discuss the candidate's file by the appropriate decision unit prior to December 1. In the case of tenure and promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, the decision unit, meeting as a committee of the whole, shall be composed of those with ranks of Associate Professor and higher with tenure. In the case of promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor, the decision unit shall consist of those who hold the rank of Full Professor. Any Department members with a familial or substantial financial relationship shall recuse themselves as having a potential conflict of interest. Members of the Department who have a PRS that splits their responsibilities between Political Science and a second Department or Program will be eligible to vote for personnel matters in the Department of Political Science if one quarter or more of their time is spent in the Department. If two or more candidates are being considered for promotion and/or tenure during any given review period, the order of review shall be determined alphabetically.

Only those who are in the appropriate decision unit and who attend the Faculty meeting evaluating the candidate shall be eligible to vote. Under no circumstances will those eligible to vote have an opportunity to vote more than once on a candidate for promotion and tenure. Those members of the Department not part of a particular decision unit or not able to attend the meeting are encouraged to communicate relevant information to the Chair. The Chair will attend and chair the decision unit's meeting but will not vote.

After a full discussion of the candidate's credentials by the appropriate decision unit, all those in attendance shall vote by secret ballot. The options for the participants are support for the promotion and/or tenure (yes), oppose (no), and abstain. The discussion during the review meeting will be undertaken in absolute confidentiality. Violations of confidentiality will be subject to appropriate departmental and University action.

Following the meeting, the Chair shall be responsible for conveying the Department vote and the sense of the meeting to the candidate within two business days. The Committee members who are also members of the decision unit will be responsible for preparing a summary of the content of the meeting. The summary will be shared with members of the decision unit and shall be the basis of the departmental report to the College. This departmental report shall be separate from the Chair's confidential evaluation that also shall be forwarded to the College.

Before the promotion or tenure file is forwarded to the College, the candidate will be given the opportunity to review the factual information in the report and to inform the Chair of any ways in which he or she believes this information is incomplete or inaccurate. The factual information does not include the Chair's report, the Committee's summary of the promotion and tenure meeting, the letters of reference, or other confidential portions of the file.

# **Article III: Policies for Term Faculty Department of Political Science**

The Department of Political Science is committed to assuring due process to all its members in reaching decisions on hiring and evaluating those employed in term positions and sets down the following guidelines for that purpose. Professional and Scientific (P&S) staff may be appointed to and evaluated for part-time term positions, in conformity with the University *Faculty Handbook* (secs. 3.3.2.1, 3.3.2.5, 5.4.1.1, and 5.4.1.2) and the policies of the Faculty Senate. At present such positions are limited to 30 percent of a P&S employee's appointment and, therefore, do not meet the criteria for full (voting) participation in departmental Faculty meetings. P&S employees are eligible to participate in P&S Committee elections and are ineligible for Faculty Senate elections.

The process of evaluating a candidate for employment in a term position begins with the PRS. This statement will describe the individual Faculty member's responsibilities and activities in the areas of teaching and, whenever appropriate for the position, service (extension, institutional service, and service to the discipline), and research.

## **Section 1: Term Faculty Titles**

**Teaching Faculty:** The primary responsibility of teaching faculty is to contribute to the teaching mission of the department. These positions must include a significant element of instruction; additional responsibilities may include advising, curriculum coordination, leadership of multi-section classes, and other responsibilities related to the teaching mission. Teaching term faculty on contracts of one year or less will be Lecturers. Assistant, Associate, or Full Teaching Professors are on multi-year contracts of a minimum of three years.

**Practice Faculty:** Practice Faculty must have significant relevant professional experience outside of academia that qualifies them to contribute to instruction and/or advising. Their primary responsibility is teaching in their area of professional expertise and related institutional and professional service.

**Adjunct Faculty:** Adjunct appointments may be appropriate for facilitating the university's aims to hire and retain excellent faculty, including dual-career couples; to carve out new areas of academic expertise; and to attract experts on extramural grants and contracts.

**Clinical Faculty:** Clinical faculty provide or oversee the delivery of professional services to individual patients or clients, and teach students, residents, or fellows of the university at the undergraduate, graduate, professional, or postgraduate level. They are expected to integrate the delivery of their professional services with their teaching.

**Research Faculty:** Research faculty primarily engage in externally funded research, and they must have opportunity to move toward research independence. At least 10%, but no more than 20%, of a research faculty member's salary shall be paid from the general fund.



## **Section 2: Term Appointments**

Hiring and reappointment and participation policies will depend on whether a person is hired for one year, two years, or more than two years.

### **Subsection A. One-Year Appointments, Less than Half-time**

Persons hired for half-time or less in the Department may be hired by the Chair of the Department alone. Such persons will normally not be appointed for longer than one year at a time (but may be reappointed) and normally will not participate (attend or vote) in departmental meetings. The Chair is free to consult other Faculty in the Department about such hires.

### **Subsection B. One-Year Appointments, More than Half-time**

All term faculty normally will initially be hired on a year-to-year basis and have one-year contracts. No notice of non-reappointment is required. When hiring for new term positions on a one-year or shorter basis, hiring will be done by the Chair alone. The Chair is free to consult other Faculty within the Department about such hires.

### **Subsection C. Multi-year Appointments, More than Half-time**

When a new term faculty member is to be appointed to a three-year or five-year contract, the Chair will appoint a faculty review committee, where possible in the candidate's field. The committee will review the candidate's materials and make a recommendation to the Chair. The Chair may act to appoint a recommended candidate for a three-year or five-year contract, contingent on budget availability and approval of the Dean and higher administration.

## **Section 3: Contract Lengths**

### **Subsection A. Lecturers**

Lecturers are short-term teaching faculty appointments, and shall have a contract length of one year or less. Such contracts are renewable for up to three years of continuous service. After three years of continuous service, Lecturers who are renewed will be renewed as Assistant Teaching Professors with three-year contracts. The change in title and contract length is not an advancement. Renewal reviews are a peer review process as specified by departmental governance documents. Term faculty at the Lecturer rank should be given a notice of three months of intent not to renew. Lecturers must be reviewed by an appropriate faculty committee and notified of an intent to renew or not renew by February 15 of their third year of continuous employment.

### **Subsection B. Assistant Term Professors**

Clinical, research, and adjunct faculty at the assistant rank shall have a contract length of one or three years. After three years of continuous service, subsequent contracts shall be for three years. Assistant teaching professors shall have three-year contracts. Assistant term faculty on three-year contracts will be reviewed in the second year of their contract. Assistant term professors are eligible

for advancement to the associate rank after five years of service at the assistant/lecturer rank, inclusive of all service under either title.

### **Subsection C. Associate Term Professors**

Associate term professors shall have a contract length of three years with renewal reviews conducted in the second year of each contract period.

### **Subsection D. Term Professors**

Term professors shall have a contract length of five years with renewal reviews conducted in the fourth year of each contract period.

## **Section 4: Evaluation Criteria for Contract Renewal and Advancement**

### **Subsection A. Teaching**

Teaching in Political Science normally involves regular on-campus, classroom instruction, but it may also involve the teaching of distance education and continuing education courses. In some cases, term faculty may be involved in other activities associated with the teaching function, including serving on master's committees, advising undergraduate students on their projects or research, and developing new forms of pedagogy.

To be eligible for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor, the faculty member must also have a record of success in executing the primary responsibilities identified in their PRS. A record of success should include a positive peer review evaluation of their teaching and evidence of pedagogical development, which can include things such as: use of creative teaching techniques, responsiveness to course assessments, innovative use of technology, or work with campus partners; and promise of further academic and professional development as a scholarly teacher. Scholarly teaching is distinct from scholarship and requires command of the subject matter, continuous growth in the subject field, and an ability to create and maintain instructional environments to promote student learning

To be eligible for promotion to Teaching Professor, a faculty member must have a proven and sustained excellence in the primary responsibilities identified in their PRS and shown effectiveness in any other areas of their PRS. To advance to the title of Teaching Professor, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences expects faculty members to participate in the mission of the university beyond routine classroom teaching in a sustained and substantial manner. They may engage the broader mission through non-routine classroom teaching or other kinds of service. Contributions supportive of advancement may include, but are not limited to:

- A record of significant curriculum improvement and development, including things such as collaborative courses and programs, innovative use of technology, and pedagogical innovation;
- Course or program coordination for multi-instructor courses;

- Substantial student service (e.g., advising individual students and student organizations, mentoring, service on graduate student committees, leading learning communities);
- A record of substantial and meaningful service to the department, university, or profession;
- A leadership role in a department, the college, or the university; and
- A record of involvement in department life and responsiveness to department needs.

Contributions to the professional field are not required, but may support advancement to the professor rank when related to the PRS. Career contributions will not offset deficiencies in PRS performance.

In evaluating teaching, the Department is concerned with the Faculty member's attitudes toward teaching and students, knowledge of the field of interest, effectiveness in presentation of course material, coherence of course organization, and validity of grading and evaluation procedures. Evidence for these indicators will come from student evaluations, course syllabi, a teaching portfolio, and peer classroom visits. The Faculty member shall be responsible for compiling and submitting the materials that he or she believes best represent the quality of his/her teaching performance. A negative evaluation of teaching based on student evaluations of teaching can only occur if the faculty member's evaluation scores are consistently statistically significantly below the mean of comparable courses.

## **Subsection B. Service**

Service refers to extension, institutional service, and service to the discipline. Extension or community-based service is consistent with the land grant mission of Iowa State University and includes those activities that involve sharing knowledge with the citizens of Iowa, the nation, and non-academic clientele around the world. These activities may take a variety of forms including conducting workshops, consulting with clients, interviews with the news media about the faculty member's professional expertise, publications in research related media outlets, and developing important resources. When term faculty have extension as part of their normal activities, they will be evaluated for those activities as well as other assignments.

Institutional service refers to those activities expected of all Faculty members in participating in departmental governance, serving on departmental, College, and University committees, and carrying out administrative duties. The Department will specify the level of institutional service desired of term faculty.

## **Subsection C. Research**

Term faculty who have research as part of their PRS will be evaluated in the same manner as tenured or tenure-eligible faculty.

# **Section 5: Evaluation Procedures for Advancement and Contract Renewal**

## **Subsection A. Introduction**

While the exact mechanisms for evaluating a term faculty member with the foregoing standards must be somewhat flexible to allow for the diversity of individual cases, the general procedures to be followed should be clear, fair, and consistent for all departmental candidates. Thus, the following procedures outline how the evaluations will be made within the Department of Political Science, focusing on the schedule of such actions, the material required from the candidates, the responsibilities of departmental Faculty, the decision unit for different candidacies, and the voting arrangements and reporting by the Department. Term faculty will be evaluated annually by the Chair. In addition, during the year prior to the final year of any multi-year contract and in the third year of term faculty on one year contracts, there will be an extensive evaluation of each term faculty member when there is the possibility of a renewal of an appointment. There will also be an extensive review if the term faculty member is seeking advancement in rank, such as to Adjunct Associate Professor or to the Teaching Associate Professor status. These reviews will include peer review.

## **Subsection B. Schedule and General Guidelines**

Generally, evaluations will adhere to the calendar outlined below, although the precise dates may vary slightly from case to case. If the schedule is changed substantially, the Chair will immediately inform the Faculty and explain the reasons for the modifications.

### **Part 1: Advancement**

Every spring, the Chair will review the personnel files to determine whether or not the contract of any term faculty member requires consideration for advancement. The term faculty member may also request consideration for advancement. He or she will also communicate with every term faculty member eligible for advancement the following academic year. By February 15 the Chair will inform the Faculty of the cases that will need to be decided. At this time, the Chair will meet with each of the candidates to explain the personnel procedures. By May 15, the Chair will provide to the candidate the names of three Faculty in the Department who will review the candidate's file(s) and conduct any classroom visits. This committee must include both tenured and term faculty at or above the rank under consideration. The candidate may request the removal of any reviewers. The Chair will decide whether or not to replace any of these people but will attempt to accommodate a candidate's reasonable request.

By September 1, the candidate will provide the Chair with the relevant materials to provide to the evaluators. The evaluators will be required to provide a draft report to the Chair and to the candidate by October 1. By October 15, the Faculty shall begin to meet to consider the final report of the review committee for that year and will attempt make a recommendation to the Chair by November 15. The Chair may schedule any of the above for early in spring semester as described in the *Faculty Handbook*.

No reviews or evaluations from persons outside the Department or outside the University will be required for teaching faculty. Letters or other evaluations from students are appropriate. For research and adjunct faculty, external letters are required.

## **Part 2: Renewal**

The primary bases for renewal of term faculty appointments are performance of the responsibilities identified in the PRS and continuing need of the department. All term faculty must receive annual review from the Chair. Faculty on multi-year contracts must receive one year notice before non-renewal. Therefore, the Department will conduct renewal reviews in the Spring semester of the penultimate year of the contract.

During the annual review meeting, the Chair will notify the term faculty member that he or she will be undergoing peer review as part of their renewal process and explain the personnel procedures. Term faculty in their first or second year on one year contracts should be notified of a decision to renew or not renew by February 15. Term faculty in their third consecutive one year contract must be notified of a decision to renew or not renew by February 15 and require peer review. The process for this review will be completed in Fall semester. By January 15, the Chair will inform the Faculty of the additional cases that will need to be decided. The Chair will provide to the candidate the names of three Faculty in the Department who will review the candidate's file(s) and conduct any classroom visits. The faculty peer review committee must include both term and tenured faculty, those at the rank of associate and above are eligible. The candidate may request the removal of any reviewers. The Chair will decide whether or not to replace any of these people but will attempt to accommodate a candidate's reasonable request

The Chair will schedule the timing of the candidate's submission of material and the vote on contract renewal in accordance with the deadlines set by the College.

### **Subsection C. Responsibilities of the Candidate**

The materials to be provided by a candidate for both advancement and contract renewal ordinarily would include, but are not restricted to, a vita, course evaluations and other assessments of teaching effectiveness, a list of courses taught in the department, course syllabi, and any evidence of service. If the candidate has research and/or service as part of his or her PRS, he or she should also submit evidence of research productivity and/or service, defined the same as in the review of tenure eligible faculty above. In addition, the candidate is encouraged to include other materials that would produce a full and fair evaluation of his or her academic performance. The candidate may be asked to add relevant materials to the packet by the Chair. The candidate's statement should outline the teaching philosophy guiding his or her work and explain how that philosophy is evident in the courses taught and other teaching activities at ISU. If there are research expectations, the candidate should provide a similar research narrative.

### **Subsection D. Decision Unit Meeting and Voting Procedures**

The Chair shall set a meeting time to discuss the candidate's file for renewal and/or advancement by the appropriate decision unit prior to meeting. The eligible voting faculty for department votes for term faculty renewal and advancement are those eligible to serve on renewal and advancement committees. Term and tenured faculty at the rank of associate and above are eligible to serve on renewal committees. Term and tenured faculty at and above the rank under consideration are

eligible to serve on advancement committees. Any Department members with a familial or substantial financial relationship shall recuse themselves as having a potential conflict of interest.

Those who are in the appropriate decision unit and who attend the Faculty meeting evaluating the candidate shall be eligible to vote. Those members of the Department not part of a particular decision unit or not able to attend the meeting are encouraged to communicate relevant information to the Department Chair. The Department Chair will attend and chair the decision unit's meeting but will not vote. Any Department members with a familial or substantial financial relationship shall recuse themselves as having a potential conflict of interest. Any Faculty member whom the Chair perceives to have a strong interpersonal conflict with a candidate shall be required to recuse themselves because of the conflict. This decision can be overruled by a majority of the faculty eligible to attend the meeting. If he or she is recused, he or she may, however, make a written statement available to the decision unit so long as it excludes any personal, irrelevant material.

After a full discussion of the candidate's credentials by the appropriate decision unit, all those in attendance shall vote by secret ballot; any who have responsibilities that require them to leave the meeting prior to its conclusion may vote after they have made their views known on the issue at hand and at the time they must leave. The options for the participants are support for the renewal or advancement (yes), oppose (no), and abstain. The discussion during the review meeting will be undertaken in absolute confidentiality. Violations of confidentiality will be subject to appropriate departmental and University action.

Following the meeting, the Chair shall be responsible for conveying the Department vote and the sense of the meeting to the candidate within two business days. The review committee will be responsible for preparing a summary of the content of the meeting. The summary will be shared with members of the decision unit and shall be the basis of the departmental report to the College. This departmental report shall be separate from the Chair's confidential evaluation that also shall be forwarded to the College.

Before an advancement file is forwarded to the College, the candidate will be given the opportunity to review the factual information in the report and to inform the Chair of any ways in which he or she believes this information is incomplete or inaccurate. The factual information will not include the Chair's report, the Committee's summary of the promotion and tenure meeting, any confidential letters of reference, or other confidential portions of the file.

## **Section 6: Participation in Departmental Meetings and Processes for Term Faculty**

Term faculty on multiple-year contracts will be invited to participate in all Department meetings. They have the right to vote at the departmental level on all matters with the following exceptions: tenured or tenure-eligible faculty hiring, appointment of the Chair, and on tenure and promotion. Term faculty may express their views to the Dean on personnel issues that affect them, as appropriate.

Teaching Associate Professors, Teaching Professors, Adjunct Associate Professors, and Adjunct Professors will be invited to participate (attend and vote) in meetings where Teaching Assistant Professors are being considered for advancement to Teaching Associate Professors and/or

Adjunct Associate Professors are being considered for advancement to Adjunct Associate Professor. Teaching Professors and Adjunct Professors will be invited to participate (attend and vote) in meetings where Teaching Associate Professors are being considered for advancement to Teaching Professors and/or Adjunct Associate Professors are being considered for advancement to Adjunct Professors.

Should there be any Visiting Faculty in this Department, regardless of credit hours taught, normally they will not participate in meetings and decisions of this Department.

Faculty holding regular appointments (whether tenured, tenure-eligible, or neither) in other Departments and holding “courtesy” appointments in this Department normally will not participate in meetings and decisions of this Department.

Members of the Department who have a PRS that splits their responsibilities between Political Science and a second Department or Program will be eligible to vote for personnel matters in the Department of Political Science if one quarter or more of their time is spent in the Department.

## **Section 7: Professional Development and Curricular Matters**

Term faculty holding more than half-time appointments and with continuing employment commitments from the Department (at least three years) will be eligible for professional development on the same basis as tenured and tenure-eligible Faculty. Departmental resources will be allocated at the discretion of the Chair. They may apply for College or University support and participate in the proposal evaluation process without prejudice from the Department.

## **Article IV: Post Tenure Review in the Department of Political Science**

### **Section 1: Overview**

The aim of the Department’s Post Tenure Review (PTR) shall be to comply with all requirements of the University’s PTR as outlined in Section 5.3.4 of the *Faculty Handbook*. In any case of possible difference between the Department’s policy and the University’s policy in this area, the latter’s policy shall govern.

### **Section 2: Faculty Subject to Review**

All tenured Faculty members will be reviewed once every seven years, beginning in the seventh year after tenure was granted. Promotion reviews (e.g., to Full Professor) and initial appointments that include tenure (e.g., Faculty hired at the Associate or Full Professor level with tenure) are considered to have undergone post tenure reviews, and therefore the PTR schedule is reset for such individuals. Any Faculty member may request a PTR (but at least 5 years must have elapsed from the last review). A Faculty member, however, must be reviewed in the year following his/her receiving two consecutive unsatisfactory annual reviews. Finally, Faculty members are exempted from their scheduled PTR if:

1) they are being reviewed for higher rank during the same year, 2) they are within one year of announced retirement or are on phased retirement, or 3) they are Faculty members who serve as Department Chair or whose title contains the term President, Senior Vice President and Provost, or Dean.

## **Section 3: Procedures**

### **Subsection A: Use of Annual Reviews**

The departmental annual evaluations include extensive information on teaching, research, and service from the previous four years, and are conducted in conjunction with the PRSs. Therefore, PTRs will be based on examination of the three most recent annual evaluations and a statement of goals and accomplishments provided by the Faculty member primarily since the last review. Specifically, all Faculty under review are required to submit at a minimum all PRSs relevant during the period under review, a self-evaluation, and a CV highlighting accomplishments during the post-tenure review period.

### **Subsection B: Review Committee**

PTRs will be conducted by an evaluation committee normally consisting of three tenured Faculty members at or above the rank of the faculty member being reviewed. At least one member of this committee must come from the Department. The committee will be appointed by the Chair after consultations among the Chair, the prospective committee members, and the Faculty member under review.

This committee will prepare a report that evaluates the Faculty member's performance in teaching, research, and service, and summarizes the overall performance utilizing one of the following recommendations and required action plans (if necessary). If an action plan is necessary, it must include at least the following three parts: 1) the justification for the plan, 2) a specific timetable for evaluation of acceptable progress on the plan, and 3) a description of possible consequences for not meeting expectations by the time of that evaluation.

- A “meeting expectations” PTR recommendation may include suggestions for future development of the faculty member. If a “meeting expectations” PTR recommendation includes a determination of “below expectations” performance in any PRS area, then the Faculty member will work with the Department Chair and the chair of the review committee to develop a detailed action plan for performance improvement in those areas. The action plan will be signed by all three parties. If agreement on the proposed action plan cannot be reached, the action plan will be negotiated following the procedures outlined for PRS mediation (Section 5.1.1.5.1 of the *Faculty Handbook*).
- A “below expectations” PTR recommendation will include specific recommendations for achieving an acceptable performance evaluation. The Faculty member will work with the Department Chair and the chair of the review committee to develop a detailed action plan for performance improvement in areas deemed below expectations. The action plan will be signed by all three parties. If agreement on the proposed action plan cannot be reached, the action plan



will be negotiated following the procedures outlined for PRS mediation (Section 5.1.1.5.1 of the *Faculty Handbook*). Failure to have the performance improvement plan in place by the time of the next academic year's annual performance review may result in a charge of unacceptable performance as defined in the Faculty Conduct Policy (Section 7.2.2.5.1 of the *Faculty Handbook*).

### **Subsection C: Reporting and Appeals**

The PTR report will be given to the Chair and the Faculty member. The Faculty member may then take the following courses of action.

- a. Accept the report as is.
- b. Accept the report as is, with the addition of a plan for future development, created in conjunction with the Department Chair and the chair of the committee.
- c. Ask the evaluating committee to consider additional information and to revise the report.
- d. Appeal to the tenured Faculty of the Department, requesting that an additional review committee be selected to review the Faculty member's materials.

### **Subsection D: Responsibility of the Department Chair**

The Department Chair will take the following actions regarding PTR:

- Review the submitted PTR report.
- Provide a cover letter to the Dean indicating agreement with the outcome of the report or a detailed explanation if there is disagreement with the report's findings. In cases of disagreement, the explanation is also communicated to the PTR committee and the candidate.
- Discuss the PTR report and its recommendations with the reviewed Faculty member.
- Work with the reviewed Faculty member and the chair of the review committee to develop the action plan for improving performance for those Faculty who received a "below expectations" recommendation. After the action plan is agreed upon, it is the responsibility of the Department Chair and the Faculty member to ensure that the action plan is implemented. It is the Chair's responsibility to assess the Faculty member's performance in accomplishing the action plan.
- Forward PTR materials to the College.

### **Subsection E: PTR and Personnel File**

The PTR report(s) and additional statements by the Faculty member relevant to the report(s) will be filed in the Faculty member's personnel file.

### **Subsection F: Faculty Members on Leave**

The Department of Political Science will postpone PTR for a given Faculty member if he or she were on leave from the University in the assigned year. Upon return from leave, however, the Faculty member would then be subject to PTR.

**Approved by Department Faculty by secret ballot, September 26, 2011. Technical amendment approved by departmental acclamation, September 28, 2011. Updated for 2014 external review and approved by departmental acclamation, September 2, 2014. Updated and approved by departmental acclamation, September 15, 2015. Updated April 26, 2016 by departmental acclamation. Updated and approved by Department Faculty secret ballot, February 8, 2019. Updated and approved by Department Faculty secret ballot, September 20, 2022. Updated and approved by Department Faculty secret ballot, October 16, 2023. Updated and approved by secret Ballot, Jan. 26, 2024.**