

**DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AND PUBLIC SERVICE**  
**Departmental Bylaws**  
*Revised October 2018*

- I. Search Procedures**
- II. EDO Guidelines**
- III. Evaluation and Expectations of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty**
- IV. Evaluation and Expectations of Non-Tenure Track Faculty**
- V. Tenure and Promotion Expectations and Procedures**

**I. Search Procedures**

A. Organization of Search Committees for all full-time faculty and staff

The Department Head will appoint a minimum of three faculty members to all faculty search committees. The members of the committee should be representative of the department as a whole in terms of rank and tenure, represent diverse subfields, and should be selected with the consultation of the department. The Department Head will appoint a chair of the search committee, with the consultation of the department. When appropriate, the search committee may include a university faculty member external to the department or student members; however, the majority of the committee must consist of faculty from the department. All members of the department are considered “associate members” of the search committee and may review the files of the candidate pool. All members of the department are expected to participate in the campus interview stage by meeting with candidates, attending campus presentations by candidates, assisting in helping the visit run smoothly, and providing their feedback to the search committee.

In cases in which a search must occur during academic breaks or the summer months, or on a truncated time table, the Department Head may obtain a waiver from the Office of Equity and Inclusion (OEI) to hire without a full search for a one-year appointment, with a full national search in order to hire for the following year.

B. Department Head Searches

In searches for Department Head, the faculty will nominate departmental faculty to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences to serve on the search committee. When appropriate, the search committee may include a university faculty member external to the department or student members; however, the majority of the committee must consist of faculty from the department. All members of the department are considered “associate members” of the search committee and may review the files of the candidate pool. All members of the department are expected to participate in the campus interview stage by meeting with candidates, attending campus presentations by candidates, assisting in helping the visit run smoothly, and providing their feedback to the search committee.

All search processes for faculty, staff, and Departmental Head will be conducted in a manner consistent with Section 3.1. (tenure-track appointments) and Section 4.1. (non-tenure-track appointments) of the *Faculty Handbook* [link] and *College of Arts and Sciences Bylaws*.

**II. EDO Guidelines**

A. Process of Evaluation

1. The calendar year for EDO evaluation will end on April 1. Except in the case of a new course being taught or an honors paper or independent project that will necessarily extend beyond that date, all activities to be counted in a given year must be completed on or before April

1. In the event that a faculty member's EDO relevant activity occurs between March 15 and April 1 and was not reported in the that year's EDO, the faculty member should report that activity in the following year's EDO report. Everything in this section of the Bylaws should be interpreted as consistent with the *Faculty Handbook* [linked to specific section] and the *College of Arts and Sciences Bylaws*.
2. The Department Head shall not judge faculty members solely on the number of activities in which they engaged, but also on the quality of their work and contributions. Unusual productivity in one activity may be more important than involvement in several. For example, intense research effort or the writing of a book may require more time than involvement in more dispersed activities. However, faculty members shall negotiate such focused efforts with the Department Head when planning EDO goals for the forthcoming year.
3. The faculty recognizes the impossibility of listing all possible activities in the EDO Guidelines. Consequently, the Department Head shall give recognition to activities that can reasonably be inferred from the guidelines.
4. Individual faculty members shall be responsible for submitting with their self-evaluation documentation (e.g., syllabi, contract letters, manuscripts, reviewers' comments) and keeping electronic records updated to assist the head in the evaluation process.
5. The purpose of the EDO annual review process is to provide regular feedback to the faculty member relative to their performance as compared to faculty standards of success as articulated in the departmental bylaws and *Faculty Handbook*. While successful progress in the EDO process cannot be a guarantee of tenure or promotion, the standards of both are the same and the expectations of the Department Head should be consistent. Problems that are articulated at the tenure and promotion process should be documented throughout the annual EDO evaluation and annual review processes.

#### B. Expectations of Faculty Accomplishments

Depending on their rank, faculty in the Political Science Department will be evaluated in the following three areas:

##### 1. Instructional/Advisement Activities

Demonstrated excellence or improvements in teaching and advising as evidenced from the following representative activities:

- student ratings from faculty instruction during the candidate's probationary period
- peer evaluation of teaching
- specific evidence of performance of students of the tenure candidate with regard to any appropriate outcome measure (e.g., student awards or recognition; student presentations of scholarly papers; student co-authorship)
- receipt of, or nomination for, outstanding teacher awards
- consistent efforts to improve quality of teaching through attendance at workshops, pedagogy and teaching conferences, reading groups, etc.
- other evidence of excellence in teaching (e.g., course syllabi and course examinations; sponsorship of honors papers and/or graduate papers or theses)
- external engagement as it relates specifically to teaching and learning
- superior academic advising of students.

All faculty are expected to carry an advising load after the first or second year. Part of expectations are advising are being responsive and available for students, being available for at least two face-to-face meetings each academic year, keeping records on the meeting with the student, staying up to date as to graduation and curricular requirements, knowing available resources on campus for students, providing accurate information, and helping students considering options in planning for study abroad, internships, graduate or professional school, and career.

2. Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities

Evidence of an on-going research pipeline with an advancing research agenda. Our discipline, with its many diverse subfields, recognizes that there are many manifestations of scholarly work, including the scholarship of discovery, application, pedagogy, and community engagement. We value these multiple types of scholarship and recognize that the different subfields of our discipline may vary in their approaches to research contribution. We will evaluate the quality of all scholarly work through evidence of an active and coherent research agenda, consistent seeking of professional and/or peer feedback of work, evidence of success through published work, and the scope (local, regional, national, and international in dissemination) and impact of the final product. This record can be evidenced, in part, by the following:

- publication, or acceptance by publisher of final manuscript for a book
- publication, or acceptance of article(s), research note(s), or review essay(s) for publication in refereed journals
- funded grants from external granting agencies
- publication, or acceptance of a book chapter(s) in a peer-reviewed book
- conference presentation at disciplinary or professional conferences
- evidence of subject matter expertise through book reviews, invited blog posts, encyclopedia entries, membership on editorial boards or services as a journal editor, or invited talks.
- technical reports for community organizations or professional organizations

3. University/Professional/Public Service Activities

Faculty are expected to serve, over time and appropriate to rank, in the department, college, University, discipline, and community. The form of this service will vary based on faculty expertise, interest, and departmental need. Commitment to the larger common good cannot be determined merely by the number of commitments, so the committee will evaluate the type of service, role of the individual participant, and the impact of the work. Demonstrated service to the department, the University, and the profession are demonstrated, in part, by the following:

- actively serving on departmental, University and professional organization committees
- chairing departmental, college, and university committees
- serving as an elected member, executive committee member, or president of the faculty senate
- serving as an officer in state, national, or international professional organization
- organizing, chairing, or being a discussant in panels at regional, national, or international professional meetings
- providing documented community service related to professional expertise
- serving as a member or officer of community, state, national, or international disciplinary or professional organizations
- serving as a reviewer for journals, books, or granting agencies
- advising a student organization or departmental group

-providing programming and events for students in the department

EDO evaluations for Masters of Public Administration (MPA) faculty members shall consider their participation and activities in support of the MPA program, including but not limited to, efforts to attain and maintain accreditation and service to the local community.

C. Exceeds Expectations

1. The faculty and the Department Head have adopted the guidelines developed by the College of Arts and Sciences to distinguish between activities that Meet Expectations and those that Exceed Expectations.
2. The awarding of an overall rating of Exceeds Expectations for Rank shall require an Exceeds Expectations for Rank rating in two of the three areas listed in Section II: A above. The awarding of Exceeds Expectations for Rank shall also require at least a Meets Expectations rating in the third category.
3. Recommendations for overall Exceeds Expectations by the Department Head to the Dean of Arts and Sciences will be based upon a comparative evaluation of all full-time department faculty. The Department Head will submit a ranked list of faculty who has been recognized as having Exceeded Expectations to the dean.

**III. Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty**

In addition to the annual EDO process, the *Faculty Handbook* and UT Board policy require a formal third year review of all tenure-track faculty (i.e., Enhanced Tenure-Track Review or ETTR), initiated by the Rank, Tenure, and Promotion Committee (RTP Committee) (see V. A. 1 below for details on the creation and governance of this committee). The department will follow a similar internal process by which faculty in their first, second, fourth, and fifth year will provide a portfolio (containing a recent CV, course evaluations from the prior year, a written response to the evaluations, copies of peer-review publications from that year, and any peer review of teaching) to the RTP Committee, the Department Head, and the administrative assistant to the department. The RTP Committee will evaluate the portfolio in terms of its progress towards tenure and promotion. The RTP committee will send a letter to the candidate and Department Head with its assessment of the candidate's process and any developmental suggestions. The Department Head will also receive the portfolio and evaluate it with the same considerations, sending comments to both the candidate and the RTP Committee. The department's administrative assistant maintains permanent files of the work of the RTP Committee.

All departmental procedure related to the evaluation expectations of tenure-track faculty should be interpreted as consistent with the *Faculty Handbook*, UT Board policy, and *UTC's ETTR Procedures*.

**IV. Evaluation and Participation of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty**

Non-tenure-faculty (e.g., lecturers and visiting professors) are full members of the department and are able to serve on all committees to which they meet the membership criterion, vote on all decisions, participate in all activities, and fully benefit from the resources of the department. All departmental procedures related to the evaluation expectations of non-tenure-track faculty should be interpreted as consistent with the *Faculty Handbook* [link to Section 4.4.].

A. Visiting Professors

All visiting professors, regardless of rank, are evaluated in the annual evaluation process the same as tenured and tenure-track faculty, with similar expectations for teaching, advising, research, and service to the discipline and department (See section II). Annual evaluations will be provided through the EDO process.

B. Lecturers

All lecturers, regardless of rank, are evaluated in the annual evaluation process the same as tenured and tenure-track faculty, with similar expectations for teaching, advising, and service to the department, university and/or community (See section II). Annual evaluations will be provided solely through the EDO process for Associate, Senior, and Distinguished Lecturers.

**Lecturers** in their first, second, third, fourth, and fifth year will provide a portfolio (containing syllabi, teaching philosophy, narrative of accomplishments, course evaluations from the prior year, a written response to the evaluations, and any peer review of teaching) to the RTP Committee, the Department Head, and the administrative assistant to the department. The RTP Committee will evaluate the portfolio in terms of its progress towards retention and promotion to Associate Lecturer. The RTP Committee will send a letter to the candidate and Department Head with its assessment of the candidate's process and any developmental suggestions. The Department Head will also receive the portfolio and evaluate it with the same considerations, sending comments to both the candidate and the RTP Committee.

**Associate Lecturer**-is a faculty member who has served at the rank of Lecturer for a minimum of four years and has demonstrated skill and commitment as a teacher and advisor for the department and willing to lead in University service.

**Senior Lecturer**-is a faculty member who has held teaching appointments at the rank of Associate Lecturer for a minimum of eight years and has demonstrated consistent excellence in teaching through outstanding teaching evaluations, peer review, excellence in advising, leadership in the teaching community on campus, or through other means.

**Distinguished Lecturer**- is held by a Senior Lecturer or an experienced scholar in the field, with a PhD in political science, public policy, public administration or similar discipline. This colleague must demonstrate consistent excellence in teaching over many years through outstanding teaching evaluations, peer review, leadership in the teaching community on campus or in the discipline, or through other means. This appointment is made with the recommendation of the RTP Committee and the support of the Department Head.

## V. **Tenure and Promotion Expectations and Procedures**

The following document is intended to clarify the "Criteria for Granting Tenure" as presented in the *Faculty Handbook*, with special application to tenure and promotion in the Department of Political Science and Public Service. The document is therefore designed to serve as a guide for new faculty in the Department of Political Science and Public Service to help them plan their goals and objectives and to provide direction for their careers at UTC. The memo from the Department Head and RTP Committee of August 2016 and attachments are also a supplement to these Bylaws. This section will also note the expectations for promotion to Full Professor in the discipline.

The awarding of tenure expresses both the department's and the University's confidence in the professional excellence of the individual as reflected in the faculty member's teaching, research, and service, including the faculty member's ability to interact appropriately with colleagues and students.

This section should not be read as conflicting in any way with the “Faculty Responsibilities” section of the *Faculty Handbook* (Chapter Two) or the *College of Arts and Sciences Bylaws*.

Section A defines specific procedures in this department’s tenure process, which may differ from those of other departments. However, nothing in these Bylaws should be understood to conflict with UT Board policy, general University policy as found in chapter three of the *Faculty Handbook*, or the *College of Arts and Sciences Bylaws*.

Section B: Selection of External Reviewers addresses the process of selecting and notifying the external committee for evaluation of the candidates file in both the tenure and promotion processes. The Department has fully adopted the College of Arts and Sciences guidelines for the external review process, found on page 7 of the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and Policies, College of Arts and Sciences.

Section C: Tenure Promotion Expectations and Procedures addresses specific clarifications, appropriate for this department, of the general criteria for tenure and promotion found in chapter three of the *Faculty Handbook*. The College of Arts and Sciences also maintains a regularly updated publication, “PROMOTION and TENURE: Guidelines and Policies for the College of Arts and Sciences,” which is endorsed by this department as a complement to these Bylaws and a valuable guide to the faculty member in preparing an effective tenure application. Neither these Bylaws nor the guide should be understood to conflict with UT Board policy, general University policy as found in chapter three of the *Faculty Handbook* or the *College of Arts and Sciences Bylaws*.

Section D: Departmental Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Full Professor addresses the criteria and expectations for promotion to Full Professor in Political Science and Public Service.

A. Departmental Procedures regarding Tenure and Promotion Recommendations

1. The department will maintain a Rank, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Committee. The membership of this committee will consist of all tenured faculty within the department with the exception of the Department Head. Tenured faculty members on leave are eligible to participate in the committee’s deliberations and voting, but are not required to do so. At the first meeting of this committee each year, the committee will elect a chair by a simple majority vote.
2. Prior to the conclusion of their probationary period, tenure-track faculty wishing to be considered for tenure shall, following existing University and college guidelines, submit a dossier to the RTP Committee containing appropriate materials pertaining to the three professional areas of teaching and advising, research and scholarship, and professional service.
3. For tenure decisions the RTP Committee will sit as a whole, as compared to promotion decisions where review is only by those members of the committee at the rank to which promotion is to be made or higher rank.
4. For tenure and promotion decisions, the vote of the committee shall be by secret ballot, rather than by a voice vote or by a show of hands. A vote of approval of tenure and promotion from the RTP Committee is defined as at least a simple majority of RTP Committee members present. A vote of denial from the RTP Committee is defined as either a vote in the negative or a tie vote on the candidate by all committee members present. Abstentions are treated as if the abstaining member of the committee had not been present. Proxy votes sent to the committee chair by any member of the RTP Committee unavailable to attend meetings of the committee or the final meeting at which a vote is taken (whether presently teaching or on leave), will not be counted. A quorum will be deemed attendance of 75% of membership. Following deliberation and the

casting of ballots, the chair of the committee shall open the ballots in the presence of the committee and announce the result to the committee members present.

5. Recommendations (denial or approval) from the RTP Committee for tenure and promotion are made to the Department Head. The vote of the RTP Committee is advisory to the Department Head and becomes part of the candidate's tenure file. After making an independent judgment on the tenure and promotion of the candidate, the Department Head shall submit his or her recommendation to the Dean with a written summary of his or her judgment. If the Department Head's recommendation differs from the recommendation of the RTP Committee, the Department Head's summary must explain the reasons for the differing judgment, and the Department Head must provide a copy of the summary to the RTP Committee. The RTP Committee may forward a dissenting report to the next level of review.
6. Recommendations (denial or approval) for tenure and promotion by the Department Head are made to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. The tenure and promotions review process will proceed as provided under Chapter 3 of the *Faculty Handbook*.

#### B. Selection of External Reviewers

The department has adopted the external review policy advanced by the College of Arts and Sciences, with the recommendation that the faculty member submit no fewer than six names of potential reviewers in the area of expertise of the candidate.

#### C. Departmental Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

The Department will recommend for tenure and promotion faculty who have demonstrated their excellence as colleagues and academics. The following are representative activities of the faculty, though not exhaustive, for the areas of teaching and advising; research, scholarship, and creative activity; and service. The department and the external reviewers will evaluate performance in terms of quality, scope, and impact.

1. Teaching & Advising: Demonstrated excellence in teaching and advising as evidenced from the following representative activities:
  - student ratings from faculty instruction during the candidate's probationary period
  - peer evaluation of teaching
  - specific evidence of performance of students of the tenure candidate with regard to any appropriate outcome measure (e.g., student awards or recognition; student presentations of scholarly papers; student co-authorship)
  - receipt of, or nomination for, outstanding teacher awards
  - consistent efforts to improve quality of teaching through attendance at workshops, pedagogy and teaching conferences, reading groups, etc.
  - other evidence of excellence in teaching (e.g., course syllabi and course examinations; sponsorship of honors papers and/or graduate papers or theses)
  - external engagement as it relates specifically to teaching and learning
  - superior academic advising of students.
2. Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity: Demonstrated record of consistent external recognition of research and scholarship through peer and/or professional review. Our discipline, with its many diverse subfields, recognizes that there are many manifestations of scholarly work, including the scholarship of discovery, application, pedagogy, and community engagement. We value these multiple types of scholarship and recognize that the different subfields of our discipline may vary in their approaches to research contribution. We will evaluate the quality of all scholarly work through

evidence of an active and coherent research agenda, consistent seeking of professional and/or peer feedback of work, evidence of success through published work, and the scope (local, regional, national, and international in dissemination) and impact of the final product. This record can be evidenced, in part, by the following:

- publication, or acceptance by publisher of final manuscript for a book
- publication, or acceptance of article(s), research note(s), or review essay(s) for publication in refereed journals
- funded grants from external granting agencies
- publication, or acceptance of a book chapter(s) in a peer-reviewed book
- conference presentation at disciplinary or professional conferences
- evidence of subject matter expertise through book reviews, invited blog posts, encyclopedia entries, membership on editorial boards or services as a journal editor, or invited talks.
- technical reports for community organizations or professional organizations

3. Service: Commitment to the larger common good cannot be determined merely by the number of commitments, so the committee will evaluate the type of service, role of the individual participant, and the impact of the work. Demonstrated service to the Department, the University, and the profession as evidenced, in part, by the following:

- actively serving on departmental, University and professional organization committees
- chairing departmental and university committees
- serving as an elected member, executive committee member, or president of the faculty senate
- serving as an officer in state, national, or international professional organization
- organizing, chairing, or being a discussant in panels at regional, national, or international professional meetings
- providing documented community service related to professional expertise
- serving as a member or officer of community, state, national, or international disciplinary or professional organizations
- serving as a reviewer for journals, books, or granting agencies

The above listing should not be considered as comprehensive listing; nor should it be assumed that the three items (teaching/advising; research; service) are of equal significance. The department places its greatest weight on the first two items, and published research is expected for the awarding of tenure and promotion.

#### D. Departmental Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Full Professor

In the Department of Political Science and Public Service, promotion to Full Professor is not based on simply continuing as a successful Associate Professor for a sustained period of time; instead, colleagues should demonstrate a substantially augmented portfolio. A successful promotion case must demonstrate significant contributions and excellence in all three areas of academic responsibility. The representative activities articulated in Section III: C-2 should provide the evidence for the applicant's portfolio.

1. Demonstrate a continuous commitment to engagement and improvement in the process of teaching and learning while maintaining academic rigor. There should be a clear contribution to the broader curriculum, rather than merely a narrow course focus. Program-level outcomes should be discussed and connected to the applicant's understanding of the discipline.

2. Demonstrate sustained contributions to the discipline's body of knowledge and illustrate applicant's role in the scholarly discourse in the subfield of expertise. A substantial record of outcomes should be in evidence, while in Political Science and Public Service there are multiple manifestations of scholarly productivity, evidence of successful peer or professional review is necessary.
3. Demonstrated service to the department, the University, and the profession should be beyond the scope of routine expectations for faculty. The cumulative record will be evaluated, and evidence of leadership roles with demonstrated impact of service is expected.