

**University of Houston**  
**Department of Political Science Bylaws**  
**Amended tenure process, Dept. approved 5/5/2015**  
**Provost approved 9/1/2015**  
**Section I Amended April 28, 2016 (to add VMOE provisions)**

**Section I: Composition of the Department, and voting provisions**

- A. The Department consists of all tenured, tenure-track, and full-time instructional members of the faculty in the department of political science, and formerly tenured faculty members who are on Voluntary Modification of Employment contracts (VMOE).
- B. Voting members of the department are those holding tenured, tenure-track, or full-time instructional appointments and formerly tenured faculty members who are on VMOE contracts, but instructional faculty and VMOE faculty may not vote on personnel matters. Members on leave for research or teaching duties are entitled to vote, but no votes shall be cast by proxy.
- C. Full-time instructional faculty and those on VMOE contracts may sit on every departmental committee except the Executive Committee and the Personnel Committee.

**Section II: Meetings of the Department**

- A. Regular meetings of the department are held each month of the academic year. The chair convokes ordinary meetings of the department. A meeting may also be convoked by five departmental members. Notice of meetings will be announced at least 72 hours in advance.
- B. The chair (or chair designee) presides over meetings. A quorum consists of a majority of members in residence. Proceedings are conducted in terms of *Robert's Rules of Order*, unless the department has adopted special rules governing selected topics.

**Section III. Selection of Department Chair**

- A. The department chair is elected for a three year term by full-time tenured and tenure-track members of a department. The procedures for electing the department chair are detailed in the bylaws of the College.
- B. If the upper administration directives prohibit the election of department chairs for three year terms, the department chair will be evaluated by the tenured and tenure-track faculty in the fall of the fourth year (on or about October 15<sup>th</sup>) following his or her initial appointment, and in the fall of every fourth year after this initial evaluation.

(1) the evaluation will be conducted by the executive committee, which will determine the form and substance of the evaluation. However, the evaluation must include a closed ended, vote of confidence item which reads

The following is a vote of confidence in the current chair. Please check one of the following

- I prefer the current chair to continue in office (vote of confidence)
- I prefer the current chair to step down, and for the department to select a new chair (vote of no confidence)

#### **Section IV: Department Administrative positions**

A. Department administrative positions consist of the Chair, Director of Graduate Studies, Director of Undergraduate Studies, Director of Technology

#### **Section V: Representatives to College and University Committees**

A. Representatives to college committees are appointed by the department chair.

B. If College or Universities bylaws require an election to a committee, the department chair will make a nomination for the position and ask if there are additional nominees. A nominee receiving 50% + 1 of the vote will be declared elected. If no nominee receives 50% + 1 of the votes, there will be a runoff among the two candidates receiving the most votes.

#### **Section VI: Department Chair**

A. The Chair is concerned primarily with general supervision and direction of the Department. The Chair represents the Department in its relationships with other Departments, the College and the administration of the Central Campus. The chair

- (1) administers the affairs of the Department
- (2) plans the general policies of the Department.
- (3) is responsible for recruitment of new departmental members
- (4) is responsible for graduate student assistants and fellows
- (5) is responsible for undergraduate students.
- (6) is responsible for the department budget

## **Section VII: Departmental Committees and other Officers**

### **A. Executive Committee**

- (1) The Executive Committee is composed of at least four members of the Department. It contains at least one member from both the full and associate professor ranks.
- (2) advises the Chair and department on promotion and termination decisions
- (3) advises the Chair regarding merit evaluations for members
- (4) advises the Chair on departmental policy questions. While the Executive Committee responds to the Chair's requests for advice, the Committee may also initiate topics for discussion with the Chair
- (5) recommends faculty for development leaves
- (6) conducts post-tenure review according to the standards and procedures spelled out in Appendix B.
- (7) monitors bylaws, handbooks and other Department, College, Campus and University documents for provisions that affect the members of the Department in their individual or collective roles.
- (8) advises the department concerning the relevance of all University of Houston documents, bylaws and handbooks to any policy initiatives by the Department or any of its members, and verifies observances
- (9) advises the department concerning the need of updating or amending the departmental bylaws when necessary to conform to policies at the College or campus level. These suggestions shall include language where appropriate,

### **C Graduate Committee**

- (1) The Graduate Committee is composed of the Director of Graduate Studies, who chairs the Committee and at least three other members of the Department
- (2) plans and directs the curriculum of the Graduate program,
- (3) receives and passes upon applications for admission to the program
- (4) develops the scheduling and program of graduate courses, under the general supervision of the department chair.
- (5) makes recommendations to the assignment of graduate teaching assistants
- (6) along with the Director of the Undergraduate Committee reviews the assignment of teaching assistants by the Graduate Director

### **D. Undergraduate Committee**

(1) The Undergraduate Committee is composed of the Director of Undergraduate Studies, who chairs the Committee, and at least three other members of the Department.

(2) plans and directs the curriculum of the undergraduate program,

(3) under the general supervision of the Undergraduate Director, develops the scheduling and program of undergraduate courses, and recommends course scheduling to the Chair.

(4) directs the normal operations of the undergraduate program. These operations include, but are not confined to, student advising, registrations, adding and dropping of courses, and necessary supervision of majors in political science.

(5) establishes policy for the coordination and content of the introductory American government courses, in cooperation with department of political science members involved in teaching these courses.

(6) administers the equivalency examination in American government.

#### E. Personnel Committee (Ad Hoc Committee, as needed)

(1) The Personnel Committee is composed of at least four members of the Department.

(2) develops procedures for the hiring of new members,

(3) directs the search for an external department chair

(4) makes recommendations to the Chair and the Department concerning other personnel policies, as needed.

(5) The Chair of the committee directs the recruitment process.

(6) The Committee makes recommendations to the faculty concerning new faculty appointments. The Departmental Chair consults the members of the Department concerning their preference prior to making a formal offer of appointment.

(a) Any full-time faculty member may make a motion calling for a vote of the faculty to express a preference on candidates for faculty positions.

If that motion receives 50% + 1 of the votes cast, there will be a vote indicating faculty preference on candidates for faculty positions.

(7) together with the Graduate and Undergraduate Directors, advises the Departmental Chairperson on the development of recruiting priorities.

#### F. The Technology Committee

(1) is composed of a director and three additional members

(2) is responsible for the operation of the social science data lab

(3) director is the representative to the Inter-University Consortium for Social and Political Research

(4) is responsible for all department technology matters

- (5) reports to the Chair about the technology needs of the department
- (6) is responsible for the interface a between the department and the library.

#### G. Committee-Department relationships

- (1) Members and Chairs of standing committees are nominated by the Departmental Chair. The number of members nominated by the Chair defines the size of the committee. Once the Department Chair has made nominations, other faculty members may make nominations. If such a nomination receives a second, there will be a vote with those receiving the most votes being declared elected.
- (2) The Departmental Chair is a non-voting *ex officio* member of all standing committees.
- (3) Standing committees report periodically to the Department, which may debate and accept, reject or modify the reports. Activity of standing committees may be expanded appropriately by the Departmental Chair.
- (4) The Departmental Chair may appoint *ad hoc* committees as necessary. The Department is advised of such actions.
- (5) The Department approves the formation of any new standing committees.

### VIII. Tenure, Promotion, Salary Increments and Original Appointments

A The Department's personnel policies are predicated on a commitment to professional accomplishment and excellence. Research scholarship, teaching and service are essential components of the undertakings of members of the Department. Each is necessary, but none is alone sufficient for tenure, promotion or salary increments. Instructional faculty are not expected to conduct research as part of their appointments, but if they do, they may request that it be considered as part of their annual evaluations.

B. Definitions and criteria of scholarship, teaching and service are described in the Appendix A to the bylaws. Appendix A is an integral part of the bylaws, and its procedures are employed in the application of policies relating to tenure and promotion.

### IX. Merit increments

A. Based on merit guidelines provided by the Dean's office, the Executive Committee will conduct merit reviews for all faculty, and make a recommendation to the Department Chair for each faculty member.

B. If the Department Chair does not accept the Executive Committee recommendation, he/she will meet with the Committee with the purpose of coming to agreement on the merit recommendation in question.

C. The merit recommendation of both the Executive Committee and the Department Chair will be reported to the faculty member if the two recommendations are not the same.

D. Faculty members have a right to appeal the merit recommendation made by the Department Chair in accordance with rules spelled out in The Faculty Handbook.

## **X. Procedures for Personnel Action: Promotion and Tenure Decisions**

A. Standards for Tenure and Promotion. The standards for promotion and/or tenure are spelled out in the Appendix A to this document.

B. Nominations. Members eligible for tenure and/or promotion may be nominated by the Departmental Chair, by the Executive Committee, or by themselves. Nominations must be made by March 15th for consideration in the following academic year. In the case of nomination for promotion to full professor, the *ad hoc* committee of full professors will issue a non-binding advisory opinion no later than April 15th.

C. Outside Evaluations. At least four letters evaluating the nominee's record of professional accomplishment shall be obtained from persons in the nominee's field of specialization according to the criteria spelled out in the "Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion" published by the Provost's office. The chair, in consultation with the executive committee, shall choose the evaluators. A candidate may present the chair and the committee with a list, for their deliberations, of potential evaluators the candidate believes would not provide an unbiased evaluation.

D. Eligibility to Vote in Tenure and/or Promotion Cases (ad hoc committees). All tenured faculty holding the rank of Associate Professor and above are eligible to vote in cases of tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor. All tenured Full Professors are eligible to vote for promotion to Full Professor.

E.. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

(1) Executive Committee Recommendation. At a date determined by the department chair, the Executive Committee will meet to vote and make a written recommendation regarding promotion to associate professor with tenure. If the vote is negative, the

nominee has five working days in which to submit a written response to the Executive Committee's recommendation. If a reconsideration is requested, the Executive Committee shall consider the nominee's response and convey its verdict to the nominee. These documents become a portion of the dossier.

(2) Review of the Executive Committee's recommendation. The respective ad hoc Committees will meet on a date specified by the department chair to consider the Executive Committee's report, and the nominee's response (if appropriate). The individual dossiers will be available for at least three calendar days prior to the ad hoc Committee meetings. These meetings are announced to the members at least three working days in advance. The Chair, or a person designated by the Chair, presides at the ad hoc committee meetings. A recommendation is made by the ad hoc committee with a simple majority vote, taken by secret ballot. Members of the Executive Committee may participate in the deliberations and provide information about their recommendation, but they may not cast a vote in the ballot of the ad hoc committee.

(3) A tenured faculty member designated by the ad hoc committee will summarize the deliberations of the ad hoc committee and its vote, and this will be reviewed by the Ad Hoc committee. The committee will then provide a written copy to the nominee. If the vote is negative, the nominee has three working days in which to submit a written response to the Ad Hoc committee requesting reconsideration. If a reconsideration is requested, the Ad Hoc committee shall consider the nominee's response and convey its decision to the nominee. These documents become a portion of the dossier.

(4) The recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee is received by the Chair. The Chair is not a voting member of the ad hoc committee, but provides an opinion in a letter to the Dean recommending for or against tenure and/or promotion.

#### F. Promotion to Full Professor

(1) Ad hoc committee recommendation. At a date determined by the department chair, the Ad Hoc committee will meet to make a written recommendation regarding promotion to full professor. Only those holding the rank of full professor may participate in these deliberations and in the vote. The individual dossiers will be available for at least three calendar days prior to the ad hoc Committee meetings. These meetings are announced to the members at least three working days in advance. The Chair, or a person designated by the Chair, presides at the ad hoc committee meetings. A recommendation is made by the ad

hoc committee with a simple majority vote, taken by secret ballot.

(2) A tenured faculty member designated by the ad hoc committee will summarize the deliberations of the ad hoc committee and its vote, and will provide a written copy to the nominee. If the vote is negative, the nominee has three working days in which to submit a written response to the Ad Hoc committee requesting recommendation. If a reconsideration is requested, the Ad Hoc committee shall consider the nominee's response and convey its decision to the nominee. These documents become a portion of the dossier.

G. Chair's action. Upon receiving a recommendation from the Ad Hoc committee, the Department Chair makes a recommendation to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences regarding tenure and/or promotion of the nominee according to the schedule set by the College following the vote of the ad hoc committee. If the chair's recommendation is at variance with that of the ad hoc Committee, the Chair explains the reason to the ad hoc Committee. The Chair's recommendation becomes a part of the dossier. The Chair communicates his/her recommendation to the nominee.

(1) The nominee has three working days in which to submit a written response to the Chair requesting reconsideration. If a reconsideration is requested, the Chair shall consider the nominee's response and convey his/her decision to the nominee.

(2) In cases of adverse recommendation by both the ad hoc Committee and the Chair, if the nominee agrees, the dossier is not forwarded to the Dean.

H. Final action. Action on the departmental recommendations is taken by the Dean, the President of the Central Campus, and the Chancellor of the university as specified by college and university policy.

I. Appeal and grievance. Grievance and appeal for reconsideration are conducted in accord with Faculty Handbook, "Appeal or Reconsideration."

J. Time table.

(1) It is the candidate's responsibility to review all departmental, college and university time tables and written guidelines including the "Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion" published by the Provost's office as well as the procedures and standards laid out in this document. It is the Chair's responsibility to inform the candidate of the existence of these documents and see that the guidelines are



followed.

(2) By May 15<sup>th</sup> the chair, in consultation with the executive committee, will choose outside evaluators to review a candidate's file.

(3) By June 1st, the candidate must have his or her file ready to be sent out for evaluation. The file must include published works, works accepted for publication, and other written materials the candidate feels are appropriate for review.

(4) By the date specified by the Provost for that year the candidate must have his or her written statement ready for inclusion in the promotion and/or tenure dossier to be reviewed by the ad hoc committee.

## **XII. Procedures Concerning Evaluations for Untenured Members**

A. Persons receiving tenure track appointments in the political science must have all the work on their dissertations completed one year after their initial appointment. Failure to meet this standard means a one-year terminal contract will be awarded for the second year in residence.

B. An evaluation of assistant professors in the third year of their tenure-track residence is mandated by the University. The evaluation proceeds in a manner analogous to the procedures employed for promotion and tenure decisions. The process terminates with the Executive Committee. The person evaluated has right of reply to the evaluation. All materials are retained in the dossier.

## **XIII. Assignment of Offices**

A. Offices are assigned based on rank and seniority. The most senior full professor (the person who has served the longest in rank as a full professor) has first choice for any available office space, followed by the next most senior full professor, down to the least senior full professor. The next choice is made by most senior associate professor, proceeding *seriatim* down to the assistant professor with least seniority.

B. In the case of ties, order of choice will be determined by lottery.

## **APPENDIX A**

### **Guidelines on Promotion and Tenure Standards for Advancement in the Department of political Science at the University of Houston**

Departmental guidelines and policies are subject to policies promulgated at the college and university levels. In the case of promotion and tenure, guidelines provided by the Office of the Provost form the basis of all promotion and tenure decisions. While a college or department may choose to implement more rigorous standards than those detailed in the university-level promotion and tenure guidelines, a college or department may not implement policies that result implicitly or explicitly in the application of less rigorous standards than detailed in the university-level promotion and tenure guidelines. It is the obligation of the chair of the department to make all new tenured or tenure-track faculty members aware in writing of not only the university university-level promotion and tenure guidelines but also any college or departmental level policies or procedures that may impact their tenure and/or promotion.

These guidelines for professional evaluation of tenured and tenure-track members of the University of Houston's Department of Political Science are prepared as a general document without reference to particular individuals or configurations of accomplishment. They do not prescribe a uniform roster of accomplishments that must be achieved by all candidates for tenure or promotion. Rather, they suggest ways of evaluating accomplishments in research, teaching, and service by allowing flexibility in assigning relative weights to these three activities. Instead of prescribing a weighting scheme across activities, it is assumed that candidates for promotion will demonstrate a level of performance satisfying the Department's expectations for research, teaching and service as spelled out below.

The Department of Political Science applies the highest standards in scrutinizing tenure and promotion of its faculty. These guidelines are intended not only to convey those standards but also to assert the autonomy of the department's judgment in their application. The Department's policy is to facilitate different academic talents and interests; therefore, these guidelines should be viewed as a reference point encouraging the faculty to further the knowledge of the discipline through quality research, teaching, and service.

#### **A. TEACHING**

Teaching is an important component of all recommendations for tenure and promotion. Satisfactory teaching is a necessary condition for tenure and promotion to associate professor. In accordance with University of Houston policy, standardized student evaluations are required in evaluating a candidate's entire teaching record. The expectation is that the candidate's

teaching record will continuously improve to be at least average relative to all political science instructors in the four semesters prior to tenure. Since some required courses historically generate lower evaluations than the median regardless of the instructor, this historical pattern will be taken into consideration when evaluating student ratings.

Teaching will also be evaluated by less quantifiable materials. These include, first, evidence of course preparations and standards as reflected in syllabi, lecture outlines, reading requirements, examinations, standards of grading, and other material relevant to an individual candidate's teaching performance. Second, other activities should be noted that enhance the minimal teaching requirements (e.g., serving on comprehensive examination and dissertation committees). Of course, institutional recognition of outstanding teaching (i.e., teaching awards) are important indicators of quality teaching.

Recognition should be given for the design and implementation of innovative courses using new technologies. More generally, the evaluation of teaching should acknowledge special innovative efforts to enhance the departments instructional capacity. Such special efforts must, of course, complement a fair share of the regular departmental teaching obligation.

## **B. RESEARCH**

As a doctoral-granting program, the Department of Political Science is a research-oriented department. Candidates for tenure and promotion are expected to enhance the department's reputation for scholarship. Furthermore, since the department explicitly considers both the quality of the past research and the potential quality of future research, decisions concerning tenure are both retrospective and prospective in nature.

In evaluating the research of candidates for tenure and promotion, the department holds the principle of peer review to be paramount. Candidates should demonstrate that a meaningful part of their published research has successfully undergone the peer review process at journals and presses regarded in the discipline as being of good quality.

The commitment to research is demonstrated by a record of publications that constitutes progress toward fulfillment of a planned program of research. That program should be described in a candidate's third-year review statement. Candidates should demonstrate evidence of intellectual independence and the ability to sustain a coherent program of research. Candidates are advised that coauthored work with senior, well-established faculty will receive less weight than co-authorship with time-in-grade peers.

While minimal quantitative standards vary by sub-field, candidates for tenure must show work beyond that completed as a graduate student. It is expected that candidates will mine their dissertations for books and articles. But that process should be essentially complete by the third

year review, and a post-dissertation research agenda should be in place.

Although it is difficult to offer precise quantitative standards for the number of publications necessary for tenure, past experience can shed some light on this matter. The examples described below are designed to provide a clearer idea about the department's standards for tenure and promotion to the untenured faculty and to the personnel committees of the department, college and university.

The actual path to tenure can vary greatly in our discipline; however, the common thread in all cases must be a sustained, scholarly effort leading to publication in quality refereed outlets. The following examples illustrate divergent paths one might take for tenure and promotion.

One path is journal publications. Without a published book, a candidate normally needs to publish a number of refereed journal articles. The exact number cannot be specified. Fewer articles in top quality journals may be equivalent to a larger number in less recognized or acclaimed journals. However, quantity cannot compensate for lack of quality under any circumstances.

Historically, the department has considered seven or eight articles (with at least half representing work completed after graduate school) constitute a prima facie case for tenure and promotion. However, the quality of these articles is the essential standard that transforms a prima facie case into one which would merit a recommendation for tenure and promotion.

A second path is typically where the candidate publishes his or her dissertation as a book. Candidates choosing this path should have all the work completed on the dissertation-to-book by the third-year review, although it is recognized that the actual publication date may be later. At the time of the third-year review, candidates should outline their post-dissertation research agenda. By tenure and promotion time, the candidate should be able to show substantial progress on a post-dissertation research agenda. Substantial progress means, for example, a completed second book or several other published works based on the research agenda outlined at the time of the third year review.

Qualitative standards are reflected in many ways. The most common criteria are books published by prestigious scholarly presses, and/or articles published in major refereed journals. For recognition of publication in specialized journals not generally known to the non-specialist, the author must provide information establishing the legitimacy and credibility of the outlet. For publication in a foreign language outlet to be recognized, a detailed abstract is necessary, and an English language version of the manuscript is desirable. Invited or contributed book chapters and ambiguous evidence of quality unless full information is available concerning the author's relationship to the editor, the circumstances of the invitation and the nature of the review process. While quality article-length works should be submitted for peer review, there are often

sound professional reasons for publishing works in edited volumes. It is, however, the burden of the candidate to explain in their written statement why the non-peer review outlet has been chosen.

The second mode of evaluating the quality of published material is provided by the invited assessments of outside referees. The “arm’s length” standard for these referees is detailed in the bylaws of the provost’s office. The referees must be recognized and well-regarded scholars of national and/or international reputation. Meeting this university requirement for positive evaluations by external referees normally means the candidate has carried out a focused body of research which, in turn, depends on having developed a specific, recognized area of expertise.

Papers prepared for annual professional meetings or ad hoc conferences do not count as evidence of scholarly accomplishment, but may be included as professional service or listed as work in progress if eventual publication is intended. Vitae filled with a record of convention papers with no evidence of likely publication are counterproductive. Overall, the record should reflect continued progress toward publication in a focused and sustained program of research which provides a basis for predicting future research productivity. Probationary candidates are strongly discouraged from writing textbooks.

Being awarded competitive grants is a positive factor in a candidate's evaluation, but it is the published result of funded research that will be weighted the most heavily. It is, however, recognized that funded research may not be published before the tenure clock expires.

### **C. SERVICE**

Service relevant to promotion and the granting of tenure occurs in (1) the institutional setting of the department, college and university; (2) the activities of the profession; and (3) in public affairs of the community. Beyond participating in faculty recruitment, probationary faculty are not expected to be heavily engaged in service activities during their first two or three years in a tenure-track position. Thereafter they are expected to carry their share of department, college, and university activities.

It is expected that candidates for promotion and tenure will be active participants in department activities. These include attending and participating in lectures by outside speakers, graduate student presentations, department meetings, as well as other professional events. Neglect of these responsibilities will diminish a candidate's chances for tenure and promotion.

Service to professional organizations is an important component of one's professional service record. This includes serving as an officer in local, regional or national organizations,

serving as an active member of an editorial board or a program committee or otherwise devoting time and energy to organizational activities.

Community activities outside the university, involving a faculty member in a professional role as a political scientist, is recognized as a service contribution. Service activities for which one's scholarly expertise is not relevant does not count as part of the service record.

### **PROMOTION FROM ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR TO PROFESSOR**

Recommendation for promotion to Professor will normally rest on the continuation and maturation of activities that merit the granting of tenure. The research record should reflect consistent and persistent progress in publications and scholarly recognition. Demonstration of capacity as an independent scholar, scholarly maturity, and recognition is imperative. Because the department considers both the quality and the quantity of the candidate's published research, there is no set number of publications that can guarantee promotion to Professor. Additions to the publication record of an Associate Professor should at least approximate the quantitative standards of this document for the earlier promotion before a candidate is considered for promotion to Professor.

Although it is not necessary that the field of research expertise be the same as that for promotion from Assistant to Associate, it is more essential for promotion to Professor that the candidate establish national or, if appropriate, international recognition for contribution to a specific field of knowledge. Such recognition attracts talented graduate students and adds favorably to the growth and development of the department's national and international reputation. More than in the case of junior scholars, citations, scholarly reviews of books, research grants, and outside evaluations are vital evidence of the significance of scholarship.

Service activities, as with scholarly publication, should reflect the advanced status of candidates for promotion to Professor. Active participation in departmental, college, university and professional affairs is assumed. The criteria for promotion are oriented more to leadership roles in regional or national associations. This should complement responsible ad hoc roles in conferences or less formal group activities, such as active participation in an APSA Section or Affiliated Group.

Teaching remains an important function for senior members of the department. Maintenance of the high quality required for the earlier promotion is of continuing great importance. Innovative contributions to department teaching are expected of senior faculty members. Candidates may also distinguish themselves through sustained contributions to the scholarly enterprise of teaching. Contributions beyond the scope of the department to the discipline at large and to other disciplines are particularly noteworthy. Contributions to the graduate program should be an established part of the candidate's professional agenda. The

record should include providing a role model as a research scholar as well as mentoring of individual graduate students through the role of directed study, thesis, or dissertation adviser.

## **Appendix B: Post Tenure Review**

1. *General Policy:* The Department of Political Science shall annually conduct a post-tenure review of its faculty in accordance with University policy. That policy mandates teaching as the dominant criterion in the evaluation but not the sole criterion. Thus the post-tenure review shall be weighted fifty (50) percent for teaching, thirty-five (35) percent for research, and fifteen (15) percent for service. A review mandating action by the department results when a faculty member is unsatisfactory in fifty (50) percent or more of his or her responsibilities using the weights described above. For example, being unsatisfactory in fifty (50) percent or more of a faculty member's responsibilities occurs when a faculty member is unsatisfactory (a) *in teaching only*; (b) *in research and service, but not in teaching*; or, (c) *in all three areas*. As indicated below, an unsatisfactory rating precipitates a mandatory Faculty Development Plan (FDP) designed by the faculty member and the department chair.

II. *Selection of Post-Tenure Review Committee.* The post-tenure review committee shall consist of four members. At the first faculty meeting in the fall semester, the chairman will nominate four tenured faculty members to serve as members of the post-tenure review committee and nominate one of the four members to be committee chair. The chairman will then ask for additional nominations from the floor. If there are none, the tenured faculty will vote to approve or disapprove the slate. If there are additional nominees, each tenured faculty member will cast one for each of four nominees. The four receiving the most votes will be declared elected. In the case of a tie there will be runoff. If the chair's nominee for the position of post-tenure review committee chair is not elected, the elected members will select a chair.

A. If the executive committee and post-tenure review committee are composed of different faculty members, the post-tenure review committee will meet with the executive committee during the annual merit review to discharge its responsibilities for post-tenure review.

### III. *An Unsatisfactory Performance in*

A. . . . teaching occurs when a faculty member exhibits incompetence and/or gross negligence in carrying out his/her teaching responsibilities. The post-tenure review process shall consider a variety of indicators to determine incompetence and/or gross negligence in teaching. These may include — but not be limited to — student evaluations; classroom neglect (e.g., such as chronic failure to meet classes, starting late and ending early, excessive absents, not holding office hours); failure to establish and maintain teaching standards (e.g., using seriously out-of-date materials; poorly designed syllabi), and failure to be attentive to the teaching enterprises (e.g., not evaluating class work in a timely fashion, failure to update exams or using out-of-date exams).



B. . . .research occurs when a faculty member abandons the scholarly enterprise. Each tenured faculty member is expected to maintain a research agenda that he/she consistently and persistently works towards. That pursuit may be demonstrated through publications (e.g., books, book chapters, and journal articles); progress on publications (e.g., as demonstrated by completed works submitted for publication, presentation of papers at professional conferences, or engagement in data collection and scholarly analysis that will lead to publications).

C. . . .service occurs when the faculty member neglects or abandons his/her university, professional, or community service obligations. Evidence that such neglect or abandonment has not occurred is demonstrated by university service (e.g., department, college, or university committee work or other jobs assigned by the chair); professional association activities (included, but not limited to, committee work in professional organizations, editorial board memberships, refereeing scholarly work for journals, book publishers, and granting institutions); and non-remunerated service to the community in the capacity of a professional political scientist.

IV. *The Post-Tenure Review Process* originates during the Executive Committee's annual merit review of faculty. Faculty members are evaluated on teaching, research and service. The value of zero is reserved to indicate unsatisfactory performance in each area. If a value of zero is assigned in any one year for teaching, research or service, the chairman will notify the faculty member, in writing, and provide an explanation for the unsatisfactory (zero) evaluation.

If a faculty member receives an unsatisfactory rating from an absolute majority of the committee in 50 percent or more of his/her activities, as outlined in paragraph I, the chair of the post-tenure review committee will ask the department chair to provide merit review files for the previous two years. If the faculty member received unsatisfactory ratings from an absolute majority of the post-tenure review committee in 50 percent or more of his/her responsibilities over the three year period, there must be a vote by an *ad hoc* committee on whether to or not to remand the person to a Faculty Development Plan. For example, if 7 or 12 post-tenure review committee members gave an evaluation of zero in 50% or more of responsibilities, as defined in paragraph I, the case goes to an *ad hoc* committee of all tenured faculty.

A. The chair of the executive committee is responsible for presenting the case to the tenured faculty requiring the person to enter a Faculty Development Plan.

B. The faculty member remanded for post-tenure review will have 10 working days for preparation to present his or her case in writing or in person to the *ad hoc* committee of tenured professors.

C. An absolute majority of the tenured faculty must vote in the affirmative for the

faculty member to be remanded into a Faculty Development Plan. This vote must be taken during one of the long (fall-spring) semesters.

D. With an affirmative vote, the faculty member must receive a written statement from the department chair that spells out the performance deficiencies supporting an unsatisfactory rating.

E. The department chair and the faculty member jointly establish a FDP. That plan must be approved by the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences and the Provost of the University.

F. While a FDP is in place for two years, the faculty member receives post-tenure evaluations. Additionally, the department chair will be responsible for monitoring the FDP. After two years, the faculty member is again reviewed by the tenured members of the department to determine the outcome of the FDP. At this time, one of three actions will take place:

- (1) Performance is sufficiently improved to be considered satisfactory.
- (2) Performance is sufficiently improved to show cause for extension of the FDP for one additional year.
- (3) Performance is still unsatisfactory. This finding will result in disciplinary action that may include, at the initiation of the University administration, dismissal under Board of Regents Policy 11.07.