

Department of Political Science Bylaws

Table of Contents

- 1) Mission of the Department
- 2) The Department
 - a) Privileges of Membership
 - b) Right to Vote
 - c) Department Meetings
- 3) The Department Chair
 - a) Responsibilities
 - b) Term
 - c) Selection
- 4) The Associate Chair
 - a) Responsibilities
- 5) The Symposium and LeFrak Forum
 - a) Directors
 - b) Mission
 - c) Review
- 6) The Departmental Faculty Advisory Committee
 - a) Election and Composition
 - b) Meetings
 - c) Responsibilities
- 7) Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee
 - a) Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Committees
 - b) Membership
 - c) Eligibility
 - d) Responsibilities
- 8) Other Officers and Committees
 - a) Faculty Secretary
 - b) Academic Hearing Board and Procedures
 - c) Director of Graduate Studies
 - d) Director of MPP Program
 - e) Director of Undergraduate Studies
 - f) Other Departmental Committees
 - g) Definition of Administrative Officers

- 9) Responsibilities of Faculty Members
 - a) Responsibilities

- 10) Academic Policies for Teaching Programs
 - a) Departmental Policies
 - b) Handbook Updates and Revisions

- 11) Graduate Student Rights and Responsibilities
 - a) PhD Graduate Student Associations
 - b) MPP Graduate Student Associations
 - c) Cases Brought by or Against Graduate Students
 - d) Membership on Committees
 - e) Right to Appear

- 12) Departmental Grievance Procedures
 - a) Who May File a Grievance
 - b) Initiation of Grievance and Hearing Procedures
 - c) Formal Hearing Procedures

- 13) Faculty Workload Policy
 - a) Definitions of the Domains of Faculty Performance
 - b) Definition of Research Active
 - c) Variable Work Assignment
 - d) Workload Distribution
 - e) Guiding Principles
 - f) Memorandum of Understanding
 - g) Redistribution of Effort

- 14) Expected Scholarly Output
 - a) Basic Expectations
 - b) Expectations for Assistant Professors
 - c) Expectations for Associate Professors
 - d) Expectations for Professors
 - e) Post Tenure Review

- 15) Faculty Evaluation Standards and Criteria
 - a) Basic Expectations for Faculty Performance
 - b) Standards and Criteria for Evaluating Research
 - c) Standards and Criteria for Evaluating Teaching
 - d) Standards and Criteria for Evaluating Service and Outreach
 - e) Types of Faculty Evaluation
 - f) Department Conflict of Interest Policy

16) Faculty Mentoring Across the Life Cycle

- a) Overview of Mentoring
- b) Career Plans
- c) A Sequence of Career Development Activities: Pre-Tenure Faculty
- d) Associate Professor Mentoring

17) Annual Performance Review

- a) Annual Performance Review Purpose
- b) Annual Performance Review Criteria
- c) Distribution of Forms, Completion of Annual Activity Reports, and Availability of APR Information
- d) Annual Performance Review Committee
- e) Evaluation Scale and Scoring
- f) APR Report to the Department Chair
- g) Chair's Preliminary APR Report to Individual Faculty
- h) Right to Appeal APR Evaluation
- i) Final APR Report to the Faculty

18) Merit Evaluation and Salary Determination

- a) Merit Evaluation
- b) Basis of Evaluation
- c) Merit Salary Determination
- d) Chair's Merit Evaluation Report to Individual Faculty
- e) Final Salary Determination and Notification

19) Procedures for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

- a) Evaluative Criteria
- b) Further Evidence Used in Promotion and Reappointment Evaluations
- c) Reappointment
- d) Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure
- e) Promotion to Professor
- f) Untenured Associate Professors
- g) Requests for Transfer to the Department
- h) The Right to Appear Before the Promotion and Tenure Committee

20) Amendment of Bylaws

Departmental Bylaws

1) Mission of the Department

The Political Science Department is part of the College of Social Science and, with the other units in the College, shares in its broad mission of being global leaders in top-tier research while advancing engaged learning and societal well-being. At its best, our science transforms the human experience and inspires leaders.

The Political Science Department seeks to achieve this goal by being at the forefront of using social science practices to evaluate current political institutions and phenomena by broadening our understanding of them, innovate them by introducing and applying new approaches or practices, and invigorate them by encouraging our students, citizens, and leaders to engage them with greater purpose and understanding. The Political Science Department has three broad types of missions: research, teaching, and service. In addition, as part of a land grant university, we are concerned with the application of scientific knowledge to practical problems and issues.

In terms of the research mission, the faculty of the Department of Political Science of Michigan State University seeks to develop, test, and apply theories of politics and to disseminate the results of this research by communicating it to the discipline, our students, and the world. Our research seeks to contribute to the development of basic knowledge within the discipline or to help to address applied problems in a larger social context.

Our educational mission at the undergraduate level is to equip students to be effective global citizens who can evaluate, innovate, and invigorate political institutions both here and abroad. Within the professional MPP Program we seek to train future policy practitioners with a specific focus on evaluation and innovation. Within the PhD program our objective is to produce professional political scientists who represent and extend our mission through their own employment in academic, research, and applied organizations.

We embrace the land grant mission of Michigan State University: it is critical to our research and educational mission to engage our responsibilities to serve our fellow citizens, locally, nationally, and throughout the world.

As a general principle, the faculty are expected to contribute, to varying degrees, to the entire mission of the department.

2) The Department

a) Privileges of Membership

i) Attendance at Department meetings shall be restricted to:

- (1) Those persons formally affiliated with the Department of Political Science who hold the academic rank of instructor or above and who are not also graduate students enrolled in the Department.
- (2) Two Ph.D. students elected for a term of one academic year by the graduate student body of the Department. The graduate student representatives shall be chosen according to

procedures specified in the Constitution of the Political Science Graduate Student Association.

(3) Visiting scholars who hold the academic rank of instructor or above.

(4) The Department Administrative Assistant and Graduate Secretary.

(5) Guests invited by the Department Chair.

b) The right to vote:

i) The right to vote shall be limited to faculty whose tenure home is in the Department of Political Science and whose rank is Assistant Professor or above.

ii) Student representatives to department meetings or committees will not be permitted to vote on:

(1) Matters of exclusive concern to the faculty, such as salary, leaves, insurance, fringe benefits, health service, housing, and retirement.

(2) Matters affecting the distinctively professional rights of the faculty, such as reappointment, promotion, tenure, and dismissal.

(3) Elected graduate student representatives may attend the annual department meeting at which graduate students are evaluated. They may attend during discussion of the evaluative criteria but must withdraw before discussion and voting on individual students.

iii) Political scientists at the University who have no formal appointment with the Department of Political Science may, if they request it, be granted courtesy status. They will not have the right to attend department meetings or vote, nor shall they be considered formal members of the Department faculty under the bylaws and tenure rules of the College or University.

c) Department Meetings

i) The Department shall meet at least once each semester (except during the period from May 15 to August 15) on the call of the Department Chair or at such other times as one-fifth of the Department members may request by petition to the Department Chair.

ii) One-half of the tenured and tenure stream faculty in residence will constitute a quorum for department meetings. Prior notice of the meeting shall be given to all voting members.

iii) The minutes of each department meeting must be circulated before, and approved at, the next regularly scheduled department meeting before being accepted as official.

iv) Faculty members must be present at the Department meeting to cast any votes.

3) The Department Chair

a) Responsibilities

i) The Chair is the chief executive officer of the Department.

ii) The Chair is responsible for the educational, research, and service programs of the Department. This responsibility includes budgetary matters, physical facilities, and personnel matters in his or her jurisdiction, taking into account the advisory procedures of the Department.

iii) As an officer of the University, the Chair is responsible for each faculty member's teaching, administrative, and committee assignments.

iv) The Chair shall have authority to appoint an Associate Chair and designate other administrative positions as necessary.

b) Term

i) The term of the Department Chair shall be for no more than five years from the date of appointment by the Board of Trustees.

- ii) The Department Chair is eligible for successive terms. When a Chair is being considered for reappointment, the procedures in Section 3.C shall be followed.
 - iii) If it becomes necessary to have an acting Department Chair, the Department shall request appointing such a person to the Dean. An Acting Chair shall have the full authority of the Department Chair. The Departmental Faculty Advisory Committee shall determine the procedures for selecting an Acting Chair.
 - iv) A Chair requesting leave for a period exceeding six consecutive months shall request such leave from the Department, and the Department shall determine by secret written ballot whether such leave is to be recommended to the Dean.
- c) Selection
- i) By September 15 during the last academic year of the Chair's term:
 - (1) The Advisory Committee Chair shall request to the Dean that the Department be authorized to proceed in initiating the selection process for Chair.
 - (2) The Advisory Committee submits the proposed search committee including the proposed chair of the committee. At a minimum the search committee must have a tenure-stream or tenured minority or woman either by election or appointment by the Advisory Committee.
 - (3) Once the Dean approves the search committee, the search committee schedules a meeting with the Dean to discuss the proposed search process.
 - (4) The Advisory Committee Chair shall follow College of Social Science procedures in conducting a search for a Department Chair..
 - ii) The Advisory Committee Chair shall inform all Department faculty eligible to vote that the nomination process for Department Chair is open. All nominees for Department Chair must be Department faculty members at the rank of Professor. Each nomination shall be submitted to the Department secretary and must be signed by two members of the faculty eligible to vote. Nominations shall close by October 1 or the first business day thereafter.
 - iii) By noon on the first business day after nominations have closed, the Advisory Committee Chair shall report the list of nominees to the Department.
 - iv) By October 15, each candidate for Department Chair shall submit a written statement of future plans and intentions for the Department. These statements shall be submitted to the Department secretary, who shall distribute them to all members of the Department, including faculty, graduate students, and staff.
 - v) The Chair of the Advisory Committee shall schedule a colloquium with the nominees to be held no later than November 1. All members of the Department, including faculty, graduate students, and staff are invited to attend. The Chair of the Advisory Committee shall preside.
 - vi) Ballots shall be distributed on November 1 or the first business day thereafter to faculty eligible to vote. The method of approval voting shall be used. The ballot shall list all candidates, and each eligible voter can cast one vote for each candidate s/he considers acceptable. No write-in votes shall be permitted
 - vii) Ballots are due by 5 p.m. on November 8 or the next business day and must be submitted to the Department secretary. At that time, the Department secretary and Chair of the Advisory Committee shall tabulate the votes and report the results immediately to the faculty. If the candidate receiving the most votes is approved by an absolute majority of all eligible voters, that candidate shall be recommended to the Dean for appointment. All ballots shall be preserved

until the appointment of the Chair is made final by the Board of Trustees. Thereafter, the ballots shall be destroyed.

- viii) If no candidate receives the approval of an absolute majority of eligible department voters, a run-off election between the two candidates with the greatest number of approval votes shall be held. Ballots shall be distributed on November 9 or the first business day thereafter to faculty eligible to vote. The ballot shall list both candidates, and each eligible voter can cast a vote for one candidate. No write-in votes shall be permitted.
- ix) Ballots are due by 5 p.m. on November 16 or the next business day and must be submitted to the Department secretary. At that time, the Department secretary and Chair of the Advisory Committee shall tabulate the votes and report the results immediately to the faculty. The candidate receiving the most votes shall be recommended to the Dean for appointment. All ballots shall be preserved until the appointment of the Chair is made final by the Board of Trustees. Thereafter, the ballots shall be destroyed
- x) If the winning candidate is the incumbent Chair, the College of Social Science procedures for review will be initiated immediately by the Advisory Committee Chair.

4) The Associate Chair

a) Responsibilities

- i) The Associate Chair shall assist the Chair in the conduct of Department business. The Associate Chair also shall fulfill the duties of the Chair during the latter's absence. When an Acting Chair is appointed, the Associate Chair shall assist the Acting Chair in the conduct of Department business and shall fulfill the duties of the Acting Chair during the latter's absence.

5) The Symposium and LeFrak Forum

a) A. Directors

- i) The Directors of the Symposium and LeFrak Forum are responsible for the administration of the Symposium on Science, Reason, and Modern Democracy and the LeFrak Forum. By the terms of their endowments and by agreement with the Department of Political Science, the College of Social Science, and Michigan State University, the Symposium and the LeFrak Forum are endeavors of the political thought and philosophy program in the Department of Political Science. Their purposes, activities, and staffing are specified in existing endowment agreements, and must be honored in the administration of the program. The Directors are appointed by the Chairman of the Political Science Department in accordance with the procedures outlined in the endowment agreements.

b) Mission

- i) The activities of the Symposium and the LeFrak Forum serve their mission to place policy issues in philosophical perspective. The endowment agreements specify that the Symposium on Science, Reason, and Modern Democracy and LeFrak Forum are an integral part of the Department of Political Science and an endeavor of the political thought and philosophy program in the Department.
- ii) The Directors of the Symposium and the LeFrak Forum must be committed to the purposes specified above and in the endowment agreements. Whenever possible, the Directors must be faculty members in the political thought and philosophy program or field.

c) Review

- i) The activities of the Symposium and the LeFrak Forum are subject to annual review by the Chair of the Department of Political Science. The Directors shall provide an annual report to the Chair of the Department summarizing program and expenditures. Both the Directors of the Symposium and LeFrak Forum and the Chair of the Department have a duty to respect the purposes specified in the endowment agreements, on penalty of potential forfeiture of the endowments.

6) The Department Advisory Committee

a) Election and Composition

- i) The Advisory Committee shall consist of four (4) members who are elected at the first Department meeting of the Fall Semester. The Department Chair shall be ineligible to vote for members of the Advisory Committee.
- ii) Election shall be by secret written ballot. Each faculty member shall vote for four committee members. One must be chosen from the assistant professors and the other three must be chosen from the tenured faculty. Two separate ballots must be used: one for the assistant professor member and one for the tenured members. Each eligible faculty member may vote for one assistant professor candidate and for three tenured candidates. Votes will be tabulated immediately in private by members of the Advisory Committee serving at the time of election. Ties will be resolved by a coin toss. After tabulations have been checked for accuracy, all tally sheets and ballots except for the total votes for each candidate shall be destroyed.
- iii) No member shall be eligible to serve more than two consecutive terms.
- iv) Vacancies shall be filled as they occur. An eligible Department member shall be elected for the remainder of the term by secret ballot as soon as practicable at a department meeting. Nominations will be made from the floor and voting will continue until one candidate has a majority or after three ballots a plurality. Ties shall be broken by a coin toss.
- v) The Advisory Committee shall elect an Advisory Committee Chair from among its members.
- vi) Advisory Committee members shall be assigned lighter administrative loads than would otherwise be the case.

b) Meetings

- i) Any three members of the Advisory Committee shall constitute a quorum. Other consultation by the Department Chair with individual Advisory Committee members is not to be considered Committee advice.
- ii) The Advisory Committee shall meet at least once a month and at such other times as a quorum may desire. The Chair of the Advisory Committee shall serve as presiding officer at each meeting, except in those instances where the Committee Chair designates another Advisory Committee member to serve in this capacity.
- iii) The Department Chair, or the Chair's designee, must be present at meetings of the Advisory Committee except in matters related to the selection of the Department Chair.

c) Responsibilities

- i) The responsibilities of the Advisory Committee shall be those of consulting with and advising the Department Chair and consulting with members of the Department with regard to the matters of academic and administrative policy listed below. Although the Advisory Committee represents the full Department, its meetings should not be considered a substitute for

Departmental meetings nor should it preclude personal contact between the Department Chair and individual members of the Department. Specific responsibilities include:

- (1) Appointment Policy and Standards
 - (a) General criteria for appointment
 - (b) The filing of new positions, and of vacancies, when they occur
 - (2) Salaries, Salary Scales, Salary Increases (including “merit increases”)
 - (a) General policy regarding salary scales and increases
 - (b) Each member of the Advisory Committee shall recommend the way in which such “merit increases” as are available shall be apportioned among members of the faculty. A list ordering the faculty by merit shall be presented to the Department Chair.
 - (3) Dismissal or Failures to Reappoint
 - (4) Leaves and Other Absences
 - (5) Any other matters that might affect the rights and duties of department personnel
- ii) The Advisory Committee may, at its discretion, meet for the purpose of clarifying with the Department Chair those problems affecting individual members that the latter do not wish to take directly to the Department Chair.
 - (1) These meetings shall not in any way preclude individual consultations, nor are they to become substitutes for the regular Advisory Committee meetings at which other functions are performed.
 - (2) The Committee may recommend to the Department Chair matters for inclusion on the agenda of department meetings.

7) The Department Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committees

- a) A Reappointment Committee will be designated for each Assistant Professor seeking reappointment to a second three-year probationary period. A Promotion and Tenure Committee will be designated for each Assistant Professor seeking promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure. Similarly, a Promotion Committee will be designated for each Associate Professor seeking promotion to the rank of Professor.
- b) Each Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee, or Promotion Committee will consist of three members.
 - i) One member of the Committee will be selected by the faculty member under review. This Committee member will be selected first, and the remaining two members will not be selected until this person has agreed to serve.
 - ii) One member of the Committee will be selected by the Chair of the Department.
 - iii) One member of the Committee will be selected by the Departmental Advisory Committee.
 - iv) The members of each Committee must be selected within ten business days after the deadline for a faculty member to inform the Department Chair of his or her intention to seek reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure during the following Fall semester.
- c) Eligibility to serve on Promotion and Tenure Committees and Promotion Committees
 - i) Faculty members at the rank of Associate Professor with tenure and Professor are eligible to serve on Reappointment or Promotion and Tenure Committees.
 - ii) Faculty members at the rank of Professor are eligible to serve on Promotion Committees.
 - iii) Faculty members at the appropriate rank may serve on more than one Promotion and Tenure Committee or Promotion Committee at the same time.

- d) Responsibilities of Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion Committees
 - i) The members of each Committee will select one of that Committee's members as Chair.
 - ii) The Chair of the Committee shall preside over the relevant portions of the department meetings convened to consider the promotion and/or tenure case of the faculty member for which the Committee was created, as described in Section 19.d.iii.e. of these Bylaws.
 - iii) Each Committee will advise the Department regarding the reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure case of the faculty member for which the Committee was created.

8) Other Officers and Committees

- a) The Faculty Secretary
 - i) The Department's Administrative Assistant shall serve as Faculty Secretary at faculty meetings.
 - ii) The Faculty Secretary shall distribute an updated copy of the Bylaws to each member of the Department prior to the first department meeting of the Fall semester.
- b) Academic Hearing Board and Procedures
 - i) All cases of complaint or grievance by graduate or undergraduate students shall be heard in compliance with the Academic Hearing Procedures of the Department of Political Science, which are on file with the Office of the Ombudsperson and the Dean of the Graduate School. The Academic Hearing Procedures shall be published each year in an appropriate forum to faculty and to graduate and undergraduate students.
 - ii) The Chair shall constitute a pool of students and faculty members who will be eligible to serve on an Academic Hearing Board by the second week of Fall semester of each academic year. The process for constituting the pool of eligible members of Hearing Boards is described in the Academic Hearing Procedures document.
- c) Director of Graduate Studies
 - i) The Chair shall select a Director of Graduate Studies, who shall be responsible for the recruitment and advising of graduate students, and for related matters.
- d) Director of the Master of Public Policy program
 - i) The Chair shall appoint a Director of the Master of Public Policy (MPP) Program, in consultation the Chair of the Department of Economics.
 - ii) The Director of the Master of Public Policy Program shall be responsible for the day-to-day administration of the program, the recruitment of prospective graduate students, the advising of current students, and the scheduling of courses in the MPP program.
 - iii) The Director of the program shall have the right to comment to the Chair on the recruitment of faculty to teach in the program, the evaluations of those involved in the MPP curriculum, and the promotion of faculty in the MPP program.
- e) Director of Undergraduate Studies
 - i) The Chair shall select a Director of Undergraduate Studies, who shall be responsible for the recruitment and advising of undergraduate students, and for related matters.
- f) Other Departmental Committees
 - i) The Chair shall create a committee or committees each year to assist in the conduct of Departmental business involving the following subjects:
 - (1) Graduate Studies, Academic Standards, PhD Admissions
 - (2) MPP Advisory/Admissions
 - (3) Undergraduate Studies

- (4) Diversity
- (5) Individual field committees
- ii) Appointments to Departmental Committees
 - (1) The Chair will appoint the membership of departmental committees (other than members are elected) and will also designate who is to chair each committee. The Chair shall appoint one graduate student to any committee or committees involving curriculum, graduate admissions and fellowships, or academic standards.
- iii) Appointments to College-Level and University-Level Committees
 - (1) The Chair will appoint faculty members to any College-level and University-level committees as required.
- g) Definition of Administrative Officers
 - i) All faculty in the following positions are considered Administrative Officers in the stipulations that follow:
 - (1) Associate Chair
 - (2) Director of Graduate Studies
 - (3) Director of the Master of Public Policy program
 - (4) Director of Undergraduate Studies

9) Responsibilities of Faculty Members

- a) It is the responsibility of each faculty member to participate actively in departmental affairs, including committee assignments, administrative duties, and the evaluation of graduate students.

10) Academic Policies for Teaching Programs

- a) The Department's policies governing the undergraduate and graduate programs shall be described in the UNDERGRADUATE HANDBOOK, the MASTER OF PUBLIC POLICY HANDBOOK, and the Ph.D. HANDBOOK, respectively.
- b) Each of these handbooks shall be revised annually.
 - i) The Director of Undergraduate Studies shall be responsible for preparing and revising the Undergraduate Handbook.
 - ii) The Director of Graduate Studies shall be responsible for preparing and revising the Ph.D. Handbook.
 - iii) The Director of the Master of Public Policy Program shall be responsible for preparing and revising the Master of Public Policy Handbook.

11) Graduate Student Rights and Responsibilities

- a) PhD Graduate Student Associations
 - i) The PhD graduate students in the Department shall create and maintain an organization called the "PhD Graduate Student Association" whose membership is restricted to political science graduate students.
 - ii) The PhD Graduate Student Association shall adopt a constitution which specifies how the Association shall govern its official duties.
 - iii) PhD graduate students who serve on Departmental committees and on college committees, and graduate students representatives to the Council of Graduate Students, shall be selected in accordance with procedures specified in the Graduate Student Association's constitution.

- b) **Master of Public Policy Graduate Student Association**
 - i) The Master of Public Policy graduate students in the Department shall create and maintain an organization called the “Master of Public Policy Graduate Student Association” whose membership is restricted to graduate students in the Master of Public Policy.
 - ii) The Master of Public Policy Graduate Student Association shall adopt a constitution that specifies how the Association shall govern its official duties.
 - iii) Master of Public Policy graduate students who serve on Departmental committees and on college committees, and graduate students representatives to the Council of Graduate Students, shall be selected in accordance with procedures specified in the Master of Public Policy Graduate Student Association’s constitution.
- c) **Cases Brought By or Against Graduate Students**
 - i) All cases brought by or against graduate students (MPP or Ph.D.) in the following areas shall be heard according to the procedures established in the Department policies regarding Academic Hearing Procedures, as specified in Section 12.b of these Bylaws.
 - (1) Academic rights and responsibilities.
 - (2) Professional rights and duties of graduate assistants.
 - (3) Professional rights and duties of other graduate students.
- d) **Membership on Committees**
 - i) PhD graduate students shall have one member on any committee dealing with curriculum, graduate admissions, fellowships, or academic standards for the PhD Program. Each representative shall be chosen by the PhD Political Science Graduate Student Association for a one-year term beginning August 15. Graduate students may also be appointed to other Department committees at the Chair’s discretion.
 - ii) Master of Public Policy graduate students shall have one member on any committee dealing with curriculum, graduate admissions, fellowships, or academic standards for the Master of Public Policy Program. Each representative shall be chosen by the Master of Public Policy Graduate Student Association for a one-year term beginning August 15. Graduate students may also be appointed to other Department committees at the Chair’s discretion.
- e) **Right to Appear**
 - i) A graduate student shall have the right to appear before any departmental committee considering his or her academic standing, professional conduct, or other rights and responsibilities in the Department. Any such committee may close a meeting for further discussion and voting.

12) Departmental Grievance Procedures

- a) **Who May File a Grievance?**
 - i) Any Political Science Department faculty member with the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, lecturer, instructor, assistant instructor, research associate, specialist, or librarian may initiate a grievance procedure, alleging violation of existing policies or established practices by an administrator, by filing a complaint with the University’s Faculty Grievance Officer (FGO) pursuant to the procedures set forth in the University’s Faculty Grievance Procedure.
- b) **Initiation of Grievances and Hearing Procedures**
 - i) **Initiation of Grievances**

- (1) A faculty member who feels aggrieved may without delay discuss the matter in a personal conference with the FGO. The FGO shall determine if the grievance falls under the Faculty Grievance Procedure, the University Committee on Faculty Tenure, or the Anti-Discrimination Judicial Board.
 - (2) In order to establish and retain access to the formal hearing mechanisms at the Political Science Department level, a faculty member must submit a written grievance statement to the FGO within 30 days of his/her first knowledge of the alleged violation. (For good cause shown, any time limits specified in this section may be waived or extended by the FGO or upon mutual agreement of the parties. References to days in this document are to calendar days.)
 - (3) The grievance statement shall set forth the alleged violation of existing policy or established practices, a concise statement of the facts relevant to the grievance, the name(s) of any administrator(s) whose action is at issue, the approximate date on which the alleged action took place, and the redress sought.
 - (4) The FGO shall forward a copy of the grievance statement to the administrator(s) named within 10 days of receipt of the grievance.
- ii) Informal Resolution
- (1) The FGO shall investigate the grievance and make every reasonable effort to resolve it informally. The FGO may recommend dropping the grievance as lacking in merit or for other just cause. Such a recommendation, however, shall not be binding on the grievant.
 - (2) Within 30 days of the filing of the grievance statement, the parties and the FGO shall attempt to resolve the grievance informally. If the FGO determines that the grievance cannot be resolved informally, notice shall be provided to the parties. If the faculty member wishes to pursue the grievance, a written request for a formal hearing must be submitted to the FGO within 30 days of such notice. Failure to submit such a request will constitute a waiver of the faculty member's right to pursue the grievance.
 - (3) The FGO shall determine after consultation with both parties the appropriate hearing level (department, college, university) and shall notify the administrator at the appropriate level of the written request for hearing.
- c) Formal Hearing Procedures
- i) A department hearing panel shall be established by the FGO in the following manner:
 - (1) A hearing panel shall consist of 3 members, draw by lot from the Department faculty. All drawing shall be conducted by the FGO.
 - (2) The FGO shall notify each party of the names drawn for the hearing panel and within 10 days either party may challenge any member for cause. In addition, each party shall have one peremptory challenge. Cause shall be determined by the Department Advisory Committee or its designee(s). Challenged members shall be replaced pursuant to the procedures state in C.1(a).
 - ii) The hearing panel shall conduct a hearing according to the procedures stated below and according to guidelines in Articles 3 and 6 of the Faculty Grievance Procedure.
 - (1) A hearing shall commence within 14 days of the establishment of the hearing panel.
 - (2) The FGO shall assemble the hearing panel and shall supervise selection of the Presiding Officer from among the members of the hearing panel.

- (3) The Presiding Officer shall apply the rules of procedure consistent with the guidelines stated in Article 6 of the Faculty Grievance Procedure.
- (4) The hearing panel shall decide whether the preponderance of the evidence does or does not support the allegation(s) made by the grievant.
- (5) Findings and recommendations of a Department hearing panel shall conform to existing policy and procedures in the Department.
- (6) Whenever a hearing panel loses a member, the hearing shall be terminated and a new panel selected.
- (7) Hearing panels shall report their findings and recommendations in writing within 14 days of the completion of the hearing to the FGO, who shall forward them to the grievant, the respondent, and the administrator who is the respondent's immediate supervisor.
- iii) The (Dean, Chair, or Director) shall provide written notification of his/her decision to the parties to the grievance and to the FGO within 14 days of his/her receipt of the findings and recommendations of the hearing panel. Failure to provide written notification shall result in automatic appeal.
- iv) If the grievance is not satisfactorily resolved, either party may appeal the decision within 14 days of the receipt of the decision of the appropriate administrator, in accordance with the procedures established in Article 5 of the Faculty Grievance Procedure.
- v) Failure to appeal within the prescribed time shall be deemed to be acceptance of the decision.

13) Faculty Workload Policy

a) Definitions of the Domains of Faculty Performance

- i) Research: investigation aimed at the discovery of scientific knowledge, revision of accepted theories in light of new knowledge, or the practical application of knowledge.
- ii) Teaching: instruction at the undergraduate or graduate levels, on-campus or off-campus, whether for credit or not for credit, and whether in regularly assigned courses or in the supervision of independent study courses and theses; and academic advising.
- iii) Service: application of one's professional skills to serve the discipline; the department, college or university; and the community outside the university.

b) **Definition of Research Active:** Faculty who have undergone APR (Section 17) and have received a Research APR below 3 over the last three consecutive years do not qualify as research active.

c) **Variable Work Assignment Policy for Tenure-System Faculty.** This policy addresses the fact that concentrated effort in one of the three areas may require faculty members to redistribute normal percentages of effort.

d) Workload Distribution.

- i) The default teaching load is 2-2. Teaching loads are determined on an annual basis.
 - (1) Faculty members who are research active qualify for a course reduction of one or more courses. While the usual reduction is one course (for a teaching load of 2-1) additional course reductions are possible.
 - (2) Faculty members who are not research active may have teaching loads greater than or less than 2-2 depending on the terms of their memorandum of understanding (Section 13.f).

ii) Each faculty member is expected to make demonstrable contributions in each of the three areas each year. The following is the default distribution of effort for each tenure stream faculty member:

- (1) Research constitutes 65% of faculty effort;
- (2) Teaching constitutes 25% of faculty effort;
- (3) Service constitutes 10% of faculty effort.

e) Guiding Principles

- i) Variable Work Assignment Policy is guided by the following principles and values:
 - (1) All three areas – research, teaching, service – are part of the regular responsibility of tenure-system faculty. Under normal circumstances, Research cannot be less than 50% and teaching and service cannot be less than 10% effort. At different times or in response to different opportunities, emphases can temporarily shift.
 - (2) Tenure carries with it both the right and the responsibility of the faculty member to determine, in concert with the Department Chair, priorities for carrying out one’s work in light of the missions of the department, college, university, and profession.
 - (3) Each of the three areas has both a maximum and minimum:
 - (a) Research may vary between 50% and 80%;
 - (b) Teaching may vary from 10% to 40%;
 - (c) Service may vary from 10% to 40%.

f) Memorandum of Understanding

- i) Each case of redistribution of effort must be accompanied by a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), prepared and agreed to by both the Chair and the faculty member before it can take effect.
 - (1) The MOU must be completed by August 16 of the year for which it is to be in effect.
 - (2) The MOU should detail the length of time for which the redistribution agreement is to be in effect.
 - (3) The MOU should detail how the reassignment will affect the evaluation of the faculty member’s work for merit pay.

g) Redistribution of Effort. Requests for redistribution of effort may be initiated either by the faculty member or the Chair. Redistribution of effort may be triggered by one of the following:

- i) A significant administrative responsibility;
- ii) A sabbatical agreement;
- iii) Receipt of a grant, fellowship, or award that buys out some portion of a teaching assignment;
- iv) Leaves of absence (paid or unpaid);
- v) A change in research active status;
- vi) In addition to the above conditions, an agreement for the redistribution of effort may be reached between the chair and the faculty member as a long-term plan to respond to changing circumstances in the faculty member’s professional work.

14) Expected Scholarly Output

a) Basic Expectations

- i) All faculty members must demonstrate a commitment to a research/scholarly activity-oriented professional career as evidenced by publications and other scholarly output which advance knowledge in their fields and by continued and serious research projects throughout their career.
- b) **Expectations for Assistant Professors**
 - i) No specific number of publications will guarantee tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. The Department's Promotion and Tenure Committee will assess each candidate's commitment to research and scholarly activity by looking at both the quantity and quality of all scholarly output.
 - ii) As a guideline, all Assistant Professors should strive for a strong publication record, whether in the form of articles, books, or both. The specific number of publications they should have by the time of promotion and tenure decision will vary based on the quality of the publications and whether they are in the form of books or articles.
 - (1) An Assistant Professor should seek to publish around two peer-reviewed publications each year, amounting to 7 to 10 publications by the time of the promotion and tenure decision. Book publications will, as a general rule, be considered as equivalent to multiple publications (see 15b-iii below for the evaluative criteria).
 - (2) Candidates at the lower end or below this standard may meet the standard for promotion with publications of exceptional quality, as indicated by the criteria in 15b.
 - (3) Candidates at the level or above may not meet the standard for promotion if, in the judgment of the Department, the quality of the publications is insufficient (as indicated by the criteria in 15b) or shows little evidence of a well-developed research agenda.
 - iii) Assistant Professors should have one quality grant application prior to going up for tenure.
 - (1) Candidates at the lower end or below this standard may meet the standard for promotion with publications of exceptional quality, as indicated by the criteria in 15b.
 - (2) Candidates at the level or above may not meet the standard for promotion if, in the judgment of the Department, the quality of the publications is insufficient (as indicated by the criteria in 15b) or shows little evidence of a well-developed research agenda.
 - iv) In evaluating the extent to which the candidate's scholarly activity has advanced knowledge, the Department will consider the quality of the publication outlets, evidence of reception by the discipline, and any other relevant information.
 - v) Working papers and draft manuscripts submitted by candidates will be evaluated for evidence of research projects in the future.
 - vi) Assistant Professors are encouraged to discuss their publication record with their mentors to interpret how it fits with the criteria stipulated here.
- c) **Expectations for Associate Professors**
 - i) All faculty members at the rank of Associate Professor must continue to demonstrate a commitment to research/scholarly activity as evidenced by scholarly output that advances knowledge in their fields.
 - ii) No specific level of scholarly output will guarantee promotion to Professor. The Department's Promotion Committee will assess each candidate's commitment to research and scholarly activity by looking at both the quantity and quality of all scholarly output.

- iii) As a guideline, all Associate Professors should strive for a strong publication record, whether in the form of books, articles, or both. The specific number of publications they should have by the time of promotion will vary based on the quality of the publications and whether they are in the form of books or articles.
 - (1) An Associate Professor should seek to publish around 1-2 publications each year, amounting to 5 to 7 articles by the time of the promotion decision. Book publications will, as a general rule, be considered as equivalent to multiple publications (see 15b-iii below for the evaluative criteria).
 - (2) Associate Professors are expected to be active in grant seeking where grant availability is consistent with a research agenda.
 - (3) Candidates at the lower end or below this standard may meet the standard for promotion with publications of exceptional quality, as indicated by the criteria in 15b.
 - (4) Candidates at the level or above may not meet the standard for promotion if, in the judgment of the Department, the quality of the publications is insufficient (as indicated by the criteria in 15b).
 - (5) Articles and books will be evaluated based on the criteria stipulated in 15bii and 15biii.
 - (6) Associate Professors should be active in the mentoring of PhD dissertations to the extent allowed by specialization and enrollment.
 - iv) In evaluating the extent to which the candidates' scholarly activity has advanced knowledge in a meaningful way, the Department will consider the quality of the publication outlets, evidence of reception by the discipline, and any other relevant information.
- d) **Expectations for Professors**
- i) All faculty members at the rank of Professor must continue to demonstrate a commitment to research/scholarly activity as evidenced by publications which advance knowledge in their fields.
 - ii) While there is no specific number of publications required for Professors, the expectation is that faculty members at this rank will average one refereed publication per year over each three-year period.
 - iii) Professors are expected to be active in grant seeking and should have at least one quality grant application during any given five-year period.
 - iv) Professors should be active in the mentoring of PhD dissertations to the extent allowed by specialization and enrollment.
- e) **Post Tenure Review**
- i) It is essential that post-tenure faculty remain active members of the department, contributing to all its missions.
 - ii) Faculty who continue to underperform in terms of their annual performance reviews will be subject to post-tenure review.
 - (1) Faculty receiving overall APR ratings of 1.5 or less for five consecutive years will be asked to develop and implement a "Performance Improvement Plan" (PIP).
 - (2) The PIP should stipulate the plan for improving faculty performance in the three-year period that follows.

- (3) This policy is only applicable for the performance period following the adoption of these bylaws.
- iii) Failure to improve performance three years after the implementation of the PIP may lead to consultations with the university administration over potential disciplinary action.
- iv) Faculty members have the right to appeal the decision that they implement a PIP. They must do so within one week of receiving the original PIP request. Appeals must be submitted in writing and sent to the Advisory Committee, which will relay the results of the appeal request within one week of receipt.
- v) Faculty members may also appeal the decision to move their case to the university administration for discussion, following the same process outlined in Section 14.e.iv.

1.5) Faculty Evaluation Standards and Criteria

a) Basic Expectations for Faculty Performance

- i) All faculty members must demonstrate a commitment to a research/scholarly activity-oriented professional career as evidenced by publications or other scholarly outputs which advance knowledge in their fields and by continued and serious research projects throughout their career. The Department's standard for evaluating research is convincing evidence of the quality, originality, scholarly repute, visibility, and impact of the faculty member's research.
- ii) All faculty members must (1) provide effective instruction in all their assigned teaching duties; (2) engage in student mentoring and support, and (3) further the broader teaching mission of the Department.
- iii) All faculty members must satisfy their annual service obligations in the Department, College, and University. Faculty members will be rewarded for the quality of their on-campus service as well as for the quality of their service to the mentoring activities, service to the profession, and outreach.

b) Standards and Criteria for Evaluating Research

- i) Peer reviewed articles, books reporting original research, and funded research grants are the clearest indications of research quality.
- ii) Peer reviewed articles will be judged to be of greater quality based upon the following criteria which are listed in descending order of importance:
 - (1) Prominence in political science;
 - (2) Five year impact factor of journal;
- iii) Books will be judged to be of greater quality based upon the following criteria which are listed in descending order of importance:
 - (1) Reporting of original research;
 - (2) Highly-regarded university press;
 - (3) Less highly regarded university press or non-university press whose output is aimed mainly at academic audiences;
 - (4) Consistently good reviews in academic outlets;
 - (5) All other peer-reviewed books.
- iv) Funded grants and grant applications will be judged to be of greater quality based upon the following criteria which are listed in descending order of importance:
 - (1) Funded research grant;

- (2) Amount of funding, including overhead provided;
- (3) High-quality grant application (as evidenced by reviews), not funded.
- v) Non-refereed publications will be judged to be of greater quality based upon the following criteria which are listed in descending order of importance:
 - (1) Reporting of original research;
 - (2) Quality of outlet (press, journal) where work is appearing;\
 - (3) Prestige of editor(s), if applicable, who assembled the edited work;
- vi) Faculty awards and/or prizes for research
- vii) Other research activities not covered by the above (e.g., creation and dissemination of original data sets, software packages, etc.) will be judged by the extent to which the product is original research and how widely disseminated or used it is.

c) Standards and Criteria for Evaluating Teaching

- i) The Department has an ongoing obligation to teach at the undergraduate, Masters, and PhD level. Faculty will be rewarded for both the quantity and quality of instruction.
- ii) Teaching will be evaluated relative to each faculty member's current designated level of teaching responsibilities.
- iii) Classroom-based instruction (either in person or online) will be assessed using the following factors:
 - (1) Adherence to the Code of Teaching Responsibility;
 - (2) Teaching Quality
 - (a) Evidence of instruction-generated student improvement in skills, knowledge, attitudes;
 - (b) Over time improvement of teaching;
 - (c) Evidence of continual efforts to improve course syllabi, materials, and instruction;
 - (d) Teaching awards;
 - (3) Teaching workload and service to the department.
 - (4) Non-classroom based instruction. The area of teaching also includes a number of activities that do not necessarily take place within a formal classroom setting. Such activities support the department's undergraduate, MPP and PhD program.
- iv) PhD Program
 - (1) PhD student placement
 - (2) Number of PhD Committees serving as chair
 - (3) Number of PhD Committees serving as member
 - (4) Publications with current or recent graduate student co-authors
 - (5) Special presentations, workshops, seminars, or new course development
- v) MPP Program
 - (1) Number of MPP final projects serving as chair
 - (2) Number of MPP final projects serving as member
 - (3) Publications with current or recent MPP student coauthors
 - (4) Special presentations, workshops, seminars, or new course development
- vi) Undergraduate Program
 - (1) Serving as Mentor for Political Science Scholars or other formal mentoring programs
 - (2) Mentoring undergraduate research projects
 - (3) Mentoring undergraduate learning assistants

- (4) Publications with current or recent undergraduate student co-authors
 - (5) Students presenting their undergraduate research projects on campus or at professional meetings
 - (6) Writing letters of recommendation for Michigan State University students and alumni
 - (7) Writing letters that result in graduate or professional school placement
 - (8) Special presentations, workshops, seminars, or course development
- d) **Standards and Criteria for Evaluating Service and Outreach**
- i) For purposes of evaluation, service comprises the application of one's professional skills to mentoring or to serve the department, the college or university, within department mentoring, the discipline, and the community outside the university.
 - ii) Service will be evaluated relative to each faculty member's current designated level of service responsibilities.
 - iii) **Service to the Department, College, and University**
 - (1) Faculty members are expected to serve on at least one department, college, or university committee each year. Service to the department, college, or university is an integral part of all faculty member's ongoing responsibilities.
 - (2) The Chair is expected to make assignments to department, college, and university committees on an equitable basis to provide all faculty with an opportunity to serve each year.
 - (3) **Factors to Consider:** The following factors should be considered
 - (a) Service as part of the Departmental Leadership Team - Associate Chair, Director Graduate Studies, MPP Director, Undergraduate Studies Director
 - (b) Service on Departmental Standing Committees (e.g., graduate studies)
 - (c) Service on ad hoc Departmental Committees (e.g., search committee)
 - (d) Service on College or University Standing Committee
 - (e) Service on College or University Ad Hoc Committee
 - iv) **Service to Faculty Mentoring** - faculty members participating in the following activities should receive credit for their service:
 - (a) Service on a formal mentoring committee
 - (b) Service on a Promotion and Tenure Committee
 - (c) Service on a Promotion Committee
 - v) **Service to Discipline** - faculty members participating in the following activities should receive credit for their service:
 - (a) Editing a professional journal
 - (b) Serving on the Editorial Board of a professional journal or book series
 - (c) Serving as an officer or Committee member in a professional association
 - (d) Chairing or serving on the program committee for a professional meeting
 - (e) Serving as a panel chair or discussant at a professional meeting
 - (f) Refereeing manuscripts and proposals
 - (g) Evaluating candidates at other institutions for tenure and promotion
 - (h) Serving on an external review committee for another program
 - (i) Service on any national or regional organization relevant to the discipline or the profession including mentoring

- vi) Outreach – As a land grant university, faculty are expected to apply their knowledge and expertise to the wider community where opportunities arise. While not a requirement for all faculty, any faculty engaging in outreach should receive appropriate credit for the service.
 - (a) Each faculty member is expected to document participation in outreach activities and provide evidence of quality in the following types of activities:
 - (i) Media interviews;
 - (ii) Presentations or pro bono testimony to any group external to the university community;
 - (iii) Other outreach activities.
- vii) Faculty awards and/or prizes for service or outreach.

e) Types of Faculty Evaluation

- i) **Mentoring:** The Department of Political Science is strongly committed to maintaining a series of career development activities that enable all members of the department can reach their full potential as scholars and teachers involving mentoring across the research, teaching, and service. There are several separate, but complementary, elements to the department’s mentoring efforts. These include: (1) Providing clear and unambiguous information as to the department’s general expectations for 3rd year reappointment and for tenure. (2) Promoting long-term career planning on the part of both junior and, where needed, senior colleagues. (3) Providing both annual individualized assessment of actual performance as well as a formative evaluation of submitted career plans. (4) Seeking early identification and positive intervention for colleagues seen to be falling short of departmental expectations.
- ii) **Annual Performance Review:** The annual performance review is a process that is focused on professional activities and productivity for the preceding reporting year. The members of the Annual Performance Review Committee evaluate each faculty member to determine the degree to which he or she has met the department's established standards during that time period.
- iii) **Merit Evaluation:** In contrast to the performance review, the Department Chair carries out the merit evaluation with input from the Advisory Committee. Each year, the Chair uses the results from the Annual Performance Review and the Career Plan (for pre-tenure faculty) as a major body of evidence to determine the merit allocations for that year. But, the Chair also can incorporate performance information from a longer time window (e.g., to allow for variations in individual productivity due to multiyear projects, variable merit pools that are available from one year to the next, etc.).
- iv) **Review for Probationary Contract Renewal.** Persons first appointed to the faculty as Assistant Professors in the tenure stream receive a 4-year probationary contract. During the third year of this probationary period, the individual shall be reviewed for appointment to an additional 3-year probationary contract as an Assistant Professor. By April 1 of each year, the Chair shall remind faculty in their second year of their probationary appointment in writing that they need to apply for probationary contract renewal during the upcoming academic year. All faculty confirming they intend to apply in writing by April 15 must be reviewed by the Department during that academic year. Renewal of a probationary appointment is not automatic. If the contract is not renewed at that time, the individual’s appointment at the University will be terminated at the end of the last year of the initial 4-year contract.

- v) **Review for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure.** Any individual holding a tenure-stream appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor is eligible to be considered for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure. By April 1 of each year, the Chair shall ask eligible faculty in writing whether they wish to be considered for promotion and tenure during the upcoming academic year. All faculty requesting such a review in writing by April 15 must be considered for promotion and tenure by the Department during that academic year. However, every individual who has reached the penultimate year of the second probationary appointment as an Assistant Professor must be reviewed for promotion and tenure during that year. If that individual is not promoted to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure by the end of the second year of that probationary appointment, the individual's appointment at the university will be terminated at the end of the third year of that appointment. Thus, the typical time in grade for promotion from the rank of Assistant Professor in the tenure stream to Associate Professor with tenure is 6 years.
- vi) **Review for Promotion to Professor.** Any individual holding an appointment as Associate Professor with tenure is eligible to be considered for promotion to the rank of Professor. By April 1 of each year, the Chair shall ask eligible faculty in writing whether they wish to be considered for promotion to Professor during the upcoming academic year. All faculty requesting such a review in writing by April 15 must be reviewed by the Department during that academic year.

f) **Department Conflict of Interest Policy**

- i) All types of faculty evaluation procedures must be consistent with the University's conflict of interest in employment policy and its guidelines pertaining to the involvement of University-defined relatives (persons connected by blood, marriage, adoption, domestic partnership, or any other personal relationship in which objectivity is impaired).

16) **Faculty Mentoring**

a) **Overview of Mentoring.**

- i) The Department of Political Science is strongly committed to maintaining a series of career development activities that enable all members of the Department to reach their full potential as scholars and teachers involving mentoring across the research, teaching, and service.
- ii) The Department realizes that mentoring places an additional set of responsibilities on tenured faculty as well. Tenured faculty involvement is crucial to the success of the mentoring program and is explicitly taken into account during the Annual Performance Review (see, i.e., 15(d)(iv)).

b) **Career Plans.** The Career Plan should include the following:

- i) **Overview**
 - (1) Career Plans are meant to be guidelines that are particular to the individual and may vary from specialty to specialty or field to field, but should conform to recognized professional standards for faculty members in the field. They may be adjusted over time as the individual's interests, focus, and career matures.
 - (2) The Career Plans become part of the individual's personnel record and are to be referred to in the Chair's Merit Evaluation Report, contract renewal decisions, and tenure and promotion decisions.

- ii) The Career Plan should include the following:
 - (1) A characterization and definition of the individual's subfield or areas of specialization (in effect, a reference group whose standards are to be applied in evaluating his or her scholarship).
 - (2) The identification of:
 - (a) Principal research problems and objectives to be addressed, as well as plans and a timetable for completing significant stages of work;
 - (b) An appropriate set of peer-reviewed disciplinary or professional journals in which to publish, along with a qualitative hierarchy among them (for individuals working on articles);
 - (c) Possible publishers for book-length manuscripts in the field, along with a qualitative hierarchy among them (for individuals working on books);
 - (d) A discussion of strategies for extramural funding through grants, contracts, and fellowships;
 - (e) A reference group or groups to be relied on for evaluation of the individual's achievements (at least one such group must be a professional academic audience);
 - (f) The development of a set of expectations related to teaching assignments, including a discussion of the balance between undergraduate and graduate, on-campus/off-campus, and credit/non-credit course;
 - (g) The formulation of a set of expectations related to the individual's role and responsibility with respect to (1) the profession, (2) the administration of the Department, college, and university, and (3) the community.

c) A Sequence of Career Development Activities – Pre-tenure Faculty

- i) A primary goal of all pre-tenure faculty members is to attain promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure. One important aspect of any mentoring program is to provide pre-tenure faculty members with information related to their performance and how that performance translates into the likelihood of promotion and tenure. Each year, a faculty member receives the results of the Annual Performance Review (APR) in the Chair's Annual Merit Review letter. These assessments are based upon past performance and hence provide a retrospective assessment.
- ii) To provide all pre-tenure faculty members with prospective input from a broader range of post-tenure faculty, the Department has a mechanism to obtain feedback at three important "waypoints" on the path toward the tenure decision:
 - (1) First-Stage Career Plan – developed during the first semester in the tenure stream appointment;
 - (2) Third Year Review and Reappointment -- during the Fall Semester of third year;
 - (3) Second-Stage Career Plan- developed during the first month of Spring Semester of the fourth year.
- iii) At each of these three waypoints, it is important to synthesize all of the available information – retrospective and prospective – in a manner that focuses directly on the future tenure decision.
 - i) To this end, a 3 person committee made up of tenured faculty in the Department of Political Science will be constructed for each provisional faculty member – at one of the three waypoints – in the following manner:

- (1) One member of the Committee will be selected by the faculty member. This Committee member will be selected first, and the remaining two members will not be selected until this person has agreed to serve.
- (2) One member of the Committee will be selected by the Chair of the Department.
- (3) One member of the Committee will be selected by the Departmental Advisory Committee.
- iv) Note that the Department Chair attends all meetings but does not participate in the explicit evaluative activities. The developmental evaluations will represent the views of a representative number of tenured faculty members who will ultimately vote on each tenure case.
- v) Mentoring Calendar. The evaluations will take place according to the following calendar:
 - (1) Spring Semester of first year – the primary basis of evaluation will be the First Stage Career Plan. Emphasis will be placed on the nature and sequencing of research output.
 - (2) Fall Semester of third year – this review will follow the current pattern of the third year review and will be based upon the following inputs: the individual’s Career Plan(s), Annual Professional Activities Reports, the Chair’s Annual Performance Evaluation Reports, and evidence on research, teaching, service, and extension. According to the Bylaws (Section 19), the basic question asked in such a review is: Is the faculty member making substantial and sufficient progress toward the granting of promotion and tenure in three years?
 - (3) Spring Semester of fourth year – this review will build upon the materials from the third-year review, subsequent publications, new or revised unpublished manuscripts, and the Second Stage Career Plan.
- vi) Developmental Feedback from Tenured Faculty
 - (1) Each committee will engage in a thorough review of each individual’s work – past, current, and proposed – to provide information regarding how one is progressing toward tenure – both in terms of quantity and quality—relative to the standards in the bylaws. Each pre-tenure faculty member will receive a written composite evaluation of their work/Career Plans including areas of strength and weakness. In addition, each evaluation will include suggestions for how to strengthen one’s portfolio for the tenure decision.
 - (2) In addition, at the fourth-year evaluation, each pre-tenure faculty member will receive the results of “progress toward tenure” vote, which asks each committee member to rate the individual’s progress toward tenure on the following five-point scale: (5) Exemplary Progress Toward Tenure, (4) Excellent Progress Toward Tenure, (3) Satisfactory Progress Toward Tenure, (2) Less than Satisfactory Progress Toward Tenure, and (1) Unsatisfactory Progress Toward Tenure.
 - (3) Upon completion of each review, the individual faculty member will meet with the Chair of the Mentoring Committee.
 - (a) The purpose of the meeting is to have a “two-way” conversation concerning strengths and weakness as well as progress and trajectory of the research agenda. It is possible that the members of the evaluation committee disagree with one another; in such instances the pre-tenure faculty member will be able to ask questions of the committee.
 - (b) The pre-tenure faculty member has the right to respond in writing to the evaluation and/or request a meeting with the entire committee to raise questions and ask for advice/guidance.
 - (c) The Committee may revise the written evaluation based upon these later interactions.

- vii) **Developmental Feedback from Department Chair.** The Department chair will hold a joint meeting each May with the pre-tenure faculty to discuss issues surrounding merit review, reappointment, and tenure. The Department chair will hold individual meetings during May as well.
- viii) **Additional Mentoring Opportunities.** This mentoring protocol for the Department of Political Science is designed to provide clear and continuing information related to each pre-tenure faculty member's prospects for tenure as well as advice as to how to improve those prospects. An important part of mentoring is tied to the evaluation of each individual's portfolio across the probationary time period. It is also important that the mentoring program provide advice. To this end, it is important that each individual have the opportunity to have one or more tenured colleagues to assist in the interpretation and implementation of the periodic evaluations.
 - (1) During the first week of Fall Semester, the Department Chair will ask all pre-tenure faculty members whether they would like a formal mentor for the coming year.
 - (2) The Department Chair shall facilitate the identification of a tenured member of the department to act as a mentor when requested by pre-tenure colleagues. All individual mentoring appointments will be for an academic year. The specific terms of the mentoring relationship are to be negotiated between the mentee, mentor and Department Chair. The appointment of a formal mentor is voluntary.
 - (3) Such mentoring may be particularly valuable during the preparation of:
 - (a) The first stage career plan;
 - (b) Preparing materials for third year review;
 - (c) The second stage career plan;
 - (d) Preparing materials for tenure review.

d) Associate Professor Mentoring

- i) Promotion to Professor connotes that a faculty member has established a well-developed internationally-recognized body of scholarship and research in one or more fields. It therefore represents something more than a faculty member continuing to regularly publish research and seek external support; rather it signifies that they have demonstrated leadership in their field through significant scholarship.
- ii) The essential qualifications for promotion to Professor are continued scholarly activity with impact, evidence of heightened professional stature and leadership in the field, and a record of seeking support for research from external sources.
- iii) Each Associate Professor must complete a third stage career plan no later than the start of their second year at the rank of Associate Professor. The career plan should outline the work necessary over the next few years that will culminate in promotion to Professor. The Third Stage Career Plan will be included in the candidate's promotion file.
- iv) The Third Stage Career Plan will be reviewed by a committee of at least two faculty members with the rank of Professor. One member of the review committee will be selected by the faculty member. The second (and potentially third) faculty member will be selected by the Chair, working in consultation with the Advisory Committee.

17) Annual Performance Review

a) Annual Performance Review

- i) Regular and rigorous evaluation of faculty performance is essential to the Department's mission.
 - ii) According to the *Faculty Handbook*, “MSU aspires to improve continuously and this requires that academic personnel decisions must build a progressively stronger faculty.... Our policies, procedures, criteria, and decisions on recruitment, reappointment, award of tenure, promotions and salary increases must be guided by the goal of increasing the academic excellence of MSU.” Hence, standards for recruitment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion must evolve upward over time, and not be guided only by past precedent in decisions of this kind.
 - iii) Each faculty member is evaluated in terms of the previously-stated standards of evaluation across research, teaching and service.
 - iv) The primary concern is to focus on evidence of the quality of the individual’s performance in each area. No fixed measure of the quantity of output or effort in the three areas separately or combined can assure a favorable evaluation.
 - v) Any assessment of performance requires professional judgment and hence is subjective. There is no objective formula for evaluation applicable to every case. However, the Department establishes guidelines defining the types of evidence to be used in performance evaluation.
- b) **Annual Performance Review Criteria.** The specific standards and criteria for faculty evaluation are presented in the Bylaw Section 15 entitled “Faculty Evaluation Standards and Criteria”.
- c) **Eligibility of Activities for Annual Performance Reporting.**
- i) The evaluation year for existing faculty members is April 1 through March 31.
 - ii) Only activities taking place during the evaluation year are eligible for inclusion in Annual Performance Review.
 - iii) An article can be reported starting at the point at which it has been accepted for publication (with an acceptance letter submitted as documentation). An article should only be reported for one cycle of Annual Performance Review (i.e., if reported when initially accepted, the article cannot be reported again when it appears in print).
 - iv) A book can be reported starting at the point at which it is in page proofs. A book should be reported for two consecutive cycles of Annual Performance Review.
- d) **Distribution of Forms, Completion of Annual Activity Reports, and Availability of APR information**
- i) The Evaluation Year: Timing of Evaluation Process
 - (1) The “evaluation year” for purposes of annual performance review will be April 1 through March 31.
 - ii) Distribution of Annual Activity Reports
 - (1) The annual activity report form for a given evaluation year will be distributed to all tenure-stream faculty no later than March 1.
 - iii) Completion of Annual Activity Reports

- (1) Individual faculty members will complete their activity reports and turn them in an electronic form to the Department's Administrative Assistant by April 1 or the first working day of April.
 - (a) Absent extraordinary circumstances, any faculty member failing to submit an annual activity report by the deadline, will receive a rating of 0 for the evaluation year.
 - (b) Each activity report will be reviewed by the Department Chair to ensure that the included information is for the current evaluation year only. Any report found to contain information outside the current evaluation year will be returned to the faculty member for revision within 48 hours.
 - iv) Availability of Annual Activity Reports
 - (1) Annual Activity Reports and supporting documentation will be placed on D2L (or an accessible intra-departmental directory) by the Department's Administrative Assistant by April 3 or within two business days of the due date for the reports.
 - (2) The Annual Activity Reports will be available to all tenure-stream faculty members once they are placed on D2L.
 - v) Output in Relation to Peers
 - (1) Each year, the Department Chair will prepare a document that lists all of the publications reported during the annual reporting year.
 - (2) The report will be available within one week of the submission of the APR reports.
- e) Annual Performance Review Committee**
- i) Each year, an Annual Performance Review Committee will be created for the purpose of:
 - (1) Reviewing faculty annual activity report forms;
 - (2) Evaluating the performance of individual faculty;
 - (3) Reporting the results to the Department Chair.
 - ii) Annual Performance Review Committee composition
 - (1) The Committee will be composed of the elected departmental Advisory Committee and two additional members.
 - (2) Membership on the Committee is open to all members of the department not serving on the departmental Advisory Committee, except for the Chair and any faculty who were selected and served on the Annual Performance Review Committee by lot during the preceding two years.
 - (3) Faculty who are on official leave during the spring semester may request that they be excused from consideration for membership on the Committee.
 - (4) Committee members selected by lot serve one year, and are then ineligible to serve as a member of the Annual Performance Review Committee selected by lot for the next two years.
 - iii) Selection of Annual Performance Review Committee members
 - (1) The two Performance Review Committee members not on the Advisory Committee will be chosen by lot by the Advisory Committee in its first meeting of the academic year.
 - (2) At least one member of the Annual Performance Review Committee not serving on the departmental Advisory Committee must be a tenured faculty member.

- (3) The members of the Annual Performance Review committee selected by lot by the department will be announced no later than the last day of classes during the fall semester of the calendar year for which performance is evaluated.
- iv) Committee Chair
 - (1) The Committee will select a Chair at its first meeting.
 - (2) The Committee Chair's main responsibilities are to:
 - (a) Oversee scheduling for the Committee;
 - (b) Tabulate the individual Committee members' ratings;
 - (c) Designate a Committee member to verify the accuracy of the tabulated figures;
 - (d) Communicate the committee's evaluations to the Department Chair.
- v) Confidentiality and Access to Information
 - (1) All deliberations within the Annual Performance Review Committee, including the attribution of specific evaluation scores to individual Committee members, are confidential (although the latter information will be provided to the Department Chair and all committee members prior to the meeting between the Annual Performance Committee and the Chair).
 - (2) The ratings provided by individual Annual Performance Review Committee members are confidential and not part of the public record (although they will be provided to the Department Chair and all committee members).
 - (3) All communications between the Committee and the Department Chair with respect to the annual evaluation are confidential.
 - (4) The completed Annual Activity Reports are considered to be part of the public record; they are open and available to all members of the Department.
- vi) Committee Meetings
 - (1) The Committee will meet at the beginning of the review process in order to choose a Committee Chair, verify information, remind themselves of the appropriate criteria, and establish a timetable for completing their evaluations.
 - (2) Evaluations of faculty are completed by the individual committee members, working on their own. It is understood that the evaluation of research, teaching and service must involve the exercise of professional judgment by individual members of the Annual Performance Review Committee. However, the members of the Annual Performance Review Committee must consider Section 15: Faculty Evaluation Standards and Criteria.
 - (3) After Committee members have completed their separate evaluations:
 - (a) The ratings are tabulated and aggregated by the Committee Chair, using the procedures described below.
 - (b) The Committee Chair will designate one other Committee member to check the accuracy of the tabulations.
 - (4) After the Committee's scores have been calculated for the faculty, the Committee will meet with the Department Chair.
 - (a) The main purpose of the meeting is to present the results of the evaluation process.
 - (b) If necessary, the Committee can provide the Department Chair with additional verbal information about the evaluation process and results.

- (c) In the meeting, particular attention should be paid to evaluation scores assigned to faculty that show a wide variance across the specific scores provided by the individual Committee members.
- (5) Committee members can change scores that they have assigned to evaluated faculty in light of new information that may come up at the meeting with the Department Chair.
 - (a) Committee members can make changes to their evaluations within three working days of the Committee's meeting with the Department Chair.
 - (b) Any revised evaluations will be given to the Committee Chair, who will then re-tabulate the ratings and provide them to the Department Chair.

f) Evaluation Scale and Scoring

- i) Each faculty member will be evaluated for performance in three areas of activity, research, teaching, and service.
- ii) The Annual Performance Review Committee will do its work and submit recommendations to the Department Chair by April 24 or within three weeks from the due date for the reports.
- iii) Relative weighting of areas
 - (1) The default weights assigned to the three areas are specified in Section 13: Faculty Workload Policy.
 - (2) Any changes to the default weights will be determined as specified in the Section 13: Faculty Workload Policy.
 - (3) The APR Committee is not to be given information about any faculty members who have MOUs that alter their weights.
- iv) Each Annual Performance Review Committee member will evaluate every faculty member except for him- or herself, the Department Chair, and university defined relatives.
 - (1) Each faculty member will be evaluated separately within each of the three areas.
 - (2) Faculty will be assigned to one of seven ordered categories in the areas of research, teaching, and service. When evaluating performance, the committee should consider the following descriptors: (7) Excellent, (6) Very Good, (5) Good, (4) Satisfactory, (3) Mediocre, (2) Poor, (1) Unacceptable.
 - (a) The assigned categories will be scored with sequential integers from one for lowest level of performance to seven for highest level of performance.
 - (b) Committee members should assign faculty to the categories based upon their overall level of performance for the evaluations year. Evaluations are based on objective criteria, not performance relative to other faculty.

g) APR Committee Report to the Department Chair

- (1) The overall ranking of faculty, to be reported to the Chair, is obtained by aggregating the individual evaluations within each area.
 - (a) For each Committee member, the full score for each faculty member is obtained by calculating a weighted average of the area-specific scores. The weights are either the default weights, or a special individual-specific set of weights, specified in an MOU (see Section 13e).
 - (b) The mean of the Committee members' full scores for each faculty member is used as the overall score for that faculty member.

- (c) The Committee members' scores for each faculty member within each of the three areas are also averaged to create an area-specific score for each faculty member.
 - (d) When creating the full scores and the area-specific scores, the scores provided by each member of the Performance Review Committee will be weighted equally.
 - (2) The Annual Performance Review Committee must provide a statement to the faculty as to the overall level and quality of faculty performance during the calendar year for which performance is evaluated.
 - (3) The committee scores are reported to the Chair. The report will include several types of information:
 - (a) Ranking of the entire faculty, created from the full scores;
 - (b) The full scores, upon which the ranking is based;
 - (c) The area-specific scores, summarizing performance within each of the three areas;
 - (d) The distribution of individual Committee members' scores for each faculty member evaluated, within each of the three areas of evaluation.
- h) Chair's Preliminary APR Report to Individual Faculty**
 - i) The Department Chair will send via email to each individual faculty member the results of their Annual Performance Review no later than April 28.
 - ii) The initial report will be limited to the committee's full and area-specific scores for the individual faculty member (that is, the mean scores for the Committee, not the specific scores provided by individual Committee members).
- i) Right to Appeal APR Evaluation**
 - i) Faculty members will have one week (May 5) to submit an appeal for reconsideration of their scoring in writing to the APR committee. The appeal may raise any questions or concerns they have about their individual scores.
 - ii) The APR committee will convene no later than May 10 to consider any appeals.
 - iii) The Department Chair will notify those faculty members who have submitted an appeal the results of the appeal process.
- j) Chair's Final APR Report to the Faculty**
- k) The Department Chair will send via email each individual faculty member the final results of their Annual Performance Review no later than three weeks after the end of the Spring semester. These results will be included in the Merit Evaluation Report discussed below. The final APR report will include the ratings and rankings for all faculty in the Department. The names of the individual faculty members will not be included.**

18) Merit Review and Salary Determination

- a) Merit Evaluation:** The Department Chair carries out the Merit Review and salary determination in the form of an annual evaluation report for each faculty member, which is:
 - ii) Sent to each faculty member and placed in his/her personnel file;
 - iii) Sent to the Dean of the College.

b) Basis of Evaluation

- i) Faculty members are to be evaluated on the basis of their actual performance and achievements.
- c) Merit Salary Determination**
- i) **Salary Pools:** In most years, the Department has access to two sources of raise dollars: Merit and Market. Using these dollars, the Department Chair will create three salary pools. To begin the Department Chair will take the Merit Raise budget and divide it into two portions. The first portion, the Shares Pool, will consist of 80% of the Merit raise pool each year. The second portion, the Chair's Discretionary Pool, will consist of the remaining 20% of the Merit raise pool. The Market allocation from the Dean and/or Provost will constitute the Market Pool.
 - ii) **Allocating Raises**
 - (1) **Shares Pool**
 - (a) The Shares Pool will be divided into 1,000 equal shares. No partial shares would be allowed.
 - (b) The 1,000 shares will be distributed by the Department Chair, with the advice of the Department's Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC), on the basis of each individual's APR scores.
 - (c) Past a threshold of minimum performance, the allocation of shares must be a positive linear function of the APR scores. E.g., all APR scores below a 2.0 or 2.5 receive no shares, but above that threshold the 1000 shares are distributed as an increasing linear function.
 - (d) The FAC would make a complete recommendation to the Department Chair for the distribution of shares but the Department Chair makes the final determination.
 - (2) **Chair Discretionary Pool**
 - (a) This pool consists of 20% of the Merit raise dollars. It is to be allocated in dollar terms at the discretion of the Department Chair with consultation by the FAC.
 - (3) **Market Pool**
 - (a) The Market pool consists of raise dollars allocated through the Dean and/or Provost market pool.
 - (b) Only faculty members who have been consistently judged to be very meritorious by peers at MSU or at comparable institutions will be considered. Typically, these individuals are also recipients of consistent merit adjustments above department averages over the previous three years.
 - (c) Individuals whose existing salaries are at levels that may not be competitive with peers may also be eligible.
- d) Chair's Merit Evaluation Report to Individual Faculty**
- (1) The Chair will prepare an evaluation letter for each faculty member.
 - (2) The first part of the evaluation letter will contain the following information from the APR Committee:
 - (a) The committee's full and area-specific scores for the faculty member (that is, the mean scores for the Committee, not the specific scores provided by individual Committee members)
 - (b) The Committee's full and area-specific scores for all other faculty members who were rated by the Committee (without including the names of other faculty members)
 - (3) The second part of the evaluation letter will provide commentary on Research, Teaching, Service, as well as an overall conclusion of performance.
 - (4) The third part of the evaluation letter will contain:

- (a) Number of shares allocated from the Market Pool;
 - (b) The letter may indicate the likelihood of receiving increments from the Chair Discretionary Pool and/or the Market Pool.
- (5) Timing of Chair's Report to Individual Faculty
- (a) The Chair's Reports should be distributed to the individual faculty no later than three weeks after the end of the Spring semester.

e) Final Salary Determination and Notification

- i) Once the Department receives the actual raise budget:
 - (1) The Department Chair will make the final salary recommendations to the Dean;
 - (2) The Department Chair will notify all faculty of the value of the year's shares.
- ii) Once the recommendations have been reviewed and accepted by the University, University-generated salary notifications will be sent to all faculty members.

19) Procedures for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

a) Expectations for Assistant Professors

- i) Is the individual recognized professionally as an authority in his or her field?
- ii) Is the individual an effective teacher?
- iii) Has the individual effectively used his or her professional skills to serve some combination of
 - (a) the academic discipline, (b) the department, college, and university, and (c) the public?

b) Further Evidence Used in Promotion and Reappointment Evaluations

- i) When answering the three general questions enumerated in Section 19a above, the primary concern is to apply clear and convincing evidence of the *quality* of the individual's performance in each area. No fixed measure of the quantity of output or effort in the three areas separately or combined can assure a favorable evaluation (but see 14b: Expectations for Assistant Professors for additional discussion regarding expected scholarly output).
- ii) Any assessment of performance requires professional judgment and hence is subjective. There is no objective formula for evaluation applicable to every case. However, the Department establishes guidelines defining the types of evidence to be used in performance evaluation.
- iii) These Guidelines should not be construed to hold faculty in any field of specialization to a different standard of performance than faculty in any other field. Faculty in all fields are equally eligible for merit salary increases, tenure, and promotion.
- iv) Cases for promotion and/or tenure are compelling only when supported by convincing evidence of the *quality, originality, scholarly repute, visibility, and impact* of the faculty member's research. In addition to the scholarly materials provided by the candidate, the Department shall include the following in its assessment:
 - (1) Letters of assessment by leading scholars and practitioners in the field;
 - (2) Evidence of the impact of the individual's research as measured, for example, by citations in the work of other scholars or in changes in practice;

- (3) Evidence of the quality, influence, and ranking of the journals that have published the individual's work, including, if possible, evidence of the acceptance rates and circulation figures of the journals;
- (4) Letters from the editor or publisher of book chapters discussing the selection criteria for chapters;
- (5) The reputation and quality of the press that publishes a book;
- (6) The individual's self-assessment.

c) **Reappointment**

- i) Selection for review will follow the process specified in 15-e-iv.
- ii) The basic question asked in such a review is: Is the faculty member making substantial and sufficient progress toward the granting of promotion and tenure in three years?
- iii) **Candidate Responsibilities.** The candidate shall provide to the Department Chair and to his or her Reappointment Committee a file composed of a curriculum vitae, copies of all published and unpublished research, a list of courses taught, course syllabi and other relevant teaching materials, Career Plans and any related personal statements, and descriptions of service activities. These materials should be provided by the candidate no later than October 1 unless a later date is agreed to by the Chair and Reappointment Committee. The candidate also shall be prepared to answer any questions posed by the Reappointment Committee as they work to prepare their report on the reappointment case. Failure to comply with these requirements will be taken as indication the candidate does not want to be reappointed.
- iv) **Department Chair Responsibilities.** The Chair shall add to the candidate's file the following: The report from the candidate's Reappointment Committee, Annual Activities Reports, all written evaluations provided to the candidate by the Chair (e.g., annual performance evaluations), teaching evaluations, and any other materials the Chair believes to be relevant to the candidate's case, except that the annual review letters shall be available only to those faculty eligible to vote in the case. The Chair shall make the entire file available to the tenured and tenure stream faculty at least ten working days prior to the department meeting on the case. Additionally, when the file is released, the Chair shall notify faculty eligible to vote in the case of the date of the faculty meeting on the case.
- v) **Reappointment Committee Responsibilities.** The Reappointment Committee bears the responsibility of presenting the evidence about the candidate to the department. The Committee shall work directly with the candidate, providing advice about the construction and composition of the reappointment file. Committee members shall go on to study the file's content in great detail, and provide a written report to the department. This report shall discuss the degree to which the candidate's record meets the departmental requirements for reappointment. The committee members also shall be prepared to provide authoritative and well-informed responses to questions from the rest of the faculty about the contents of the candidate's record and his or her potential for future scholarly growth. The Reappointment Committee shall confine its activities to producing a clear and coherent body of information about the case that provides useful guidance for the votes of eligible individual faculty members (including those serving on the committee).
- vi) **Department Meetings.** Prior to the faculty vote, two meetings shall occur. Faculty eligible to vote in the case shall meet to discuss each case of reappointment. No vote shall be taken at the

- meeting. Untenured faculty members will meet to provide input on the reappointment decision. The Chair of the Reappointment Committee shall preside over both meetings.
- vii) Faculty Vote. Immediately after the department meeting, the Department Chair shall issue ballots to faculty eligible to vote in the case. In cases involving reappointment, faculty eligible to vote shall consist of the tenured members of the Department. The ballot shall include a provision for a yes or no vote, and space for written comments (allowing attachments). Ballots can be signed at the discretion of the individual faculty member. These ballots must be returned within three working days.
 - viii) Faculty Advisory Committee. After the faculty ballots have been returned, the Faculty Advisory Committee shall tabulate the results and report these results immediately to the faculty.
 - ix) Chair recommendation. Following the faculty vote, the Department Chair shall provide a recommendation to the Dean of the College Social Science. The Department Chair is also responsible for submitting all other required information the College of Social Science.

d) Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

- i) The meaning of Tenure. According to the *Michigan State University Faculty Handbook*: “The purpose of tenure is to assure the University staff academic freedom and security and to protect the best interests of the University. Tenure shall not be considered to protect any person from the loss of his/her position as a result of gross misconduct such as the violation of professional ethics or withdrawal or actions which are inimical to the interests of the University.”
- ii) A decision on promotion to Associate Professor with tenure involves a retrospective judgment based on the criteria described in Sections 19a and 19b. Along with the retrospective judgment, there is a prospective evaluation: a candidate must show a clear likelihood of sustained and substantial high-quality performance.
- iii) Procedures for Nomination and Review
 - (1) Faculty whose initial appointment is at the rank of Associate Professor without tenure are to be reviewed in accordance with the procedures specified for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure.
 - (2) The following procedures shall apply to internal and external candidates for tenure. In no case shall an external candidate be considered for tenure without a complete review consistent with the procedures described below.
 - (a) Selection for review will follow the process specified in 15-e-v.
 - (i) Faculty whose initial appointment is as an Associate Professor without tenure (normally with a 4-year initial appointment, but with a possible range of between 2 and 5 years) are to be reviewed in accordance with the procedures specified for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure. In addition, according to the Faculty Handbook:

If an associate professor is reappointed, tenure is granted. Individuals appointed at the rank of associate professor without tenure have an option of requesting reappointment at any point prior to the conclusion of the stipulated probationary appointment period. A negative decision on such a request shall not preclude consideration for reappointment at the time specified upon appointment

- (b) External Letters. The Chair shall ask the candidate to identify a list of at least six potential outside evaluators who are nationally recognized authorities in the candidate's fields. The Chair shall seek to obtain letters from three of the persons listed. In addition, the Chair shall seek to obtain another three outside letters from nationally recognized authorities.
- (i) It is the policy of this Department that all letters of reference are confidential. Although relevant faculty and administrators should have access to them, confidential letters are not to be duplicated or shown to the person about whom the letters are written. Nor should the contents of these letters be described orally or in writing to persons not authorized to know the contents.
- (ii) The Department follows University Policy with regard to the confidentiality of outside letters, viz., Memorandum #A/23/91-92 (Dec. 2, 1991) from the Provost: "University policy on confidentiality of letters of references is that all letters soliciting evaluation relative to reappointment, promotion, and tenure recommendations must include the unit's statement on confidentiality. [For further details, see the memorandum, on file in the Department office.]"
- (c) Candidate Responsibilities. The candidate shall provide to the Department Chair and to his or her Promotion and Tenure Committee a file composed of a curriculum vitae, copies of all published and unpublished research, a list of courses taught, course syllabi and other relevant teaching materials, Career Plans and any related personal statements, and descriptions of service activities. These materials should be provided by the candidate no later than August 15 unless a later date is agreed to by the Chair and Promotion and Tenure Committee. The candidate also shall be prepared to answer any questions posed by the Promotion and Tenure Committee as they work to prepare their report on the tenure and promotion case. Failure to comply with these requirements will be taken as indication the candidate does not want to be reappointed.
- (d) Department Chair Responsibilities. The Chair shall add to the candidates file the following: The report from the candidates Promotion and Tenure Committee, Annual Activities Reports, all written evaluations provided to the candidate by the Chair (e.g., third year review, annual performance evaluations), teaching evaluations, the external letters evaluating the candidate, and any other materials the Chair believes to be relevant to the candidates case. The Chair shall make the entire file available to the tenured and tenure stream faculty at least ten working days prior to the department meeting on the case, except that the annual review letters and external letters shall be available only to those faculty eligible to vote in the case. Additionally, when the file is released, the Chair shall notify faculty eligible to vote in the case of the date of the faculty meeting on the case.
- (e) Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities. The Promotion and Tenure Committee bears the responsibility of presenting the evidence about the candidate to the department. The Committee shall work directly with the candidate, providing advice about the construction and composition of the tenure and promotion file. Committee members shall go on to study the file's content in great detail, and provide a written report to the department. This report shall discuss the degree to which the

candidate's record meets the departmental requirements for tenure and/or promotion. The committee members also shall be prepared to provide authoritative and well-informed responses to questions from the rest of the faculty about the contents of the candidate's record and his or her potential for future scholarly growth. The Promotion and Tenure Committee shall confine its activities to producing a clear and coherent body of information about the case that provides useful guidance for the votes of eligible individual faculty members (including those serving on the committee).

- (f) **Department Meetings.** Prior to the faculty vote, two meetings shall occur. Faculty eligible to vote in the case shall meet to discuss each case of promotion or tenure. No vote shall be taken at the meeting. Untenured faculty members will meet to provide input on the tenure decision. The Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee shall preside over both meetings.
- (g) **Faculty Vote.** Immediately after the department meeting, the Department Chair shall issue ballots to faculty eligible to vote in the case. In cases involving promotion to associate professor or tenure at the associate professor level, faculty eligible to vote shall consist of the tenured members of the Department. The ballot shall include a provision for a yes or no vote, and space for written comments (allowing attachments). Ballots can be signed at the discretion of the individual faculty member. These ballots must be returned within three working days.
- (h) **Faculty Advisory Committee.** After the faculty ballots have been returned, the Faculty Advisory Committee shall tabulate the results and report these results immediately to the faculty.
- (i) **Chair recommendation.** Following the faculty vote, the Department Chair shall provide a recommendation to the Dean of the College Social Science. The Department Chair is also responsible for submitting all other required information the College of Social Science.

e) Promotion to Professor

i) **Criteria**

- (1) A decision on promotion to Professor involves both a retrospective and a prospective judgment. Along with the retrospective judgment (see 14c: Expectations for Associate Professors), there is a prospective evaluation: a candidate must show a clear likelihood of sustained and substantial high-quality performance.
- (2) A recommendation for promotion from associate professor to professor in the tenure system should be based on several years of sustained, outstanding achievements in, research, teaching, and/or public service as an associate professor.
- (3) The individual must also demonstrate a sustained and substantial high-quality performance and a substantial national reputation, and that this pattern of excellence and productivity is likely to continue throughout the career.

ii) **Procedures for Nomination and Review**

- (1) **Nominations.**
 - (a) Selection for review will follow the process specified in 15-e-vi.
- (2) **Other Procedures.**

- (a) The remaining steps in the review procedure are the same as those described for nominations to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure, except that faculty eligible to vote shall consist of those with the rank of Professor in the Department.

f) Untenured Associate Professors

- i) Faculty whose initial appointment is at the rank of Associate Professor without tenure are to be reviewed in accordance with the procedures specified for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure.

g) Requests for Transfer to the Department

- i) Untenured tenure-stream faculty already at Michigan State University who wish to transfer their tenure home to the Department of Political Science must follow the following procedures:
 - (1) Write a letter to the Department Chair with a copy to Dean of the College stating the desire to change tenure home along with a short explanation of why the change is being sought. A current CV should be included and the individual should arrange for three letters of recommendation to be submitted to the Department.
 - (2) The Department Chair will bring the request to the Department's Faculty Advisory Committee. If the Chair and the FAC concur, then the individual will be invited to present an example of their research to a colloquium of the faculty.
 - (3) After the colloquium, tenure-stream faculty in the Department will be invited to provide feedback as to whether the individual should be invited to join the Department. Such feedback will be provided in writing and, at the discretion of the Chair, at a faculty meeting.
 - (4) The Department Chair will decide whether to grant the request for transfer of the tenure home.
- ii) Tenured faculty already at Michigan State University who wish to transfer their tenure home to the Department of Political Science must follow the following procedures:
 - (1) Write a letter to the Department Chair with a copy to Dean of the College stating the desire to change tenure home along with a short explanation of why the change is being sought. A current CV should be included.
 - (2) The Department Chair will bring the request to the Department's Faculty Advisory Committee. If the FAC and the Chair concur, then the procedures described above with regards to "Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure." In particular, this includes (but is not limited to) seeking external letters and the formation of an individual Promotion and Tenure Committee.
- iii) Tenured faculty already at Michigan State University who do not wish to transfer their tenure home but seek to transfer a partial appointment to the Department of Political Science must follow the following procedures:
 - (1) Write a letter to the Department Chair with a copy to Dean of the College stating the desire to make a partial change along with a short explanation of why the change is being sought. A current CV should be included and the individual should arrange for three references to be contacted by the Department.
 - (2) The Department Chair will bring the request to the Department's Faculty Advisory Committee. If the Chair and the FAC concur, then the individual will be invited to present an example of their research to a colloquium of the faculty.

- (3) After the colloquium, tenure-stream faculty in the Department will be invited to provide feedback as to whether the individual should be invited to have a partial appointment in the Department. Such feedback will be provided in writing to the Chair and Faculty Advisory Committee and, at the discretion of the Chair, at a faculty meeting.
- (4) After receiving feedback, the FAC votes on whether to approve of the transfer, where a two-thirds majority in favor is necessary for approval. If approval does not pass, a full faculty vote can be called by the Chair such that a simple majority of faculty favoring transfer grants approval.

h) The Right to Appear before the Promotion and Tenure Committee

- i) Each faculty member being considered for a promotion or tenure decision may request an appearance before the Promotion and Tenure Committee and Department Chair to provide any further information that he or she wishes before a recommendation is made by the Chair. Such a request may be made as an appeal from action by the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

20) Amendment of Bylaws

- a) The Bylaws of the Department shall be amended only in the following way:
 - i) Proposal by a majority at a Department meeting in which a quorum is present.
 - ii) An Australian ballot shall be circulated to all voting members by the Administrative Assistant. Minutes or other explanatory materials shall be included for those not resident on campus. The Advisory Committee shall count the ballots and destroy all tally sheets except the final "Yes" or "No" votes.
 - iii) The Faculty Secretary shall announce the results of the vote within thirty days after the day of the original proposal.
 - iv) An absolute majority of all the Department voting members shall be required for adoption.
 - v) Recognizing that Department Bylaws are the shared responsibility of the faculty and the Dean, the Dean shall be informed of any amendments that are adopted by the faculty.