

V. Faculty Promotion and Tenure

(Adopted by tenured members of the Political Science (GINT) Department on December 16 and 19, 1994; adjustments approved by tenured faculty April 11, 1995, August 23, 1995, January 14, 1997, and April 29, 1997; amended on April 27, 2001, April 19, 2002, August 26, 2011, and May 27, 2013.

APPROVED BY UCTP October 16, 2013

A. Promotion and Tenure Criteria

1. General

a. These promotion and tenure criteria are adopted by the tenured faculty of the Department of Political Science to fit its particular needs, recognizing the scholarly diversity of this Department. The criteria are not intended to prescribe a uniform pattern of accomplishments that must be achieved by all candidates for tenure or promotion. Rather, they identify ways of evaluating accomplishments in the three areas of research/scholarship, teaching, and service, while permitting the flexibility necessary to accommodate individual talents and interests within the general guidelines set by the College and the University in the *Faculty Manual*. The October 5, 2012 revision of the *Faculty Manual* was in effect at the time of the latest revision of these criteria. In the remainder of this document, it is understood that “Outstanding” implies a higher standard than “Excellent” and “Excellent” implies a higher standard than “Good.”

Candidates being considered for their first promotion may use either the criteria in place when they were hired or the criteria in place when they are being considered; candidates being considered for their second promotion must use the criteria in effect at that time.

2. Promotion Eligibility.

a. Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor -- The faculty member will normally hold the earned doctor's degree and will have a record of scholarly achievement beyond the doctoral dissertation and an evident capacity for significant contribution to his/her field. If hired from another institution in which the candidate held a tenure-track position as an Assistant Professor, there is no set minimum time of service at USC before promotion to associate professor can be considered. The candidate's total record will be considered for promotion. An Excellent level of performance must be demonstrated in the category of research/scholarship. A Good level of performance in the categories of teaching and service are required. The Department recognizes that in certain sub-fields, a stronger contribution in the service component may be considered.

i. Research/Scholarship – Excellent performance in this area is demonstrated by meeting three criteria. First, the candidate must demonstrate the existence of a sustained program of research oriented to or guided by a significant set of theoretical and substantive issues in his or her field(s) of specialization. In this respect, a written statement by the candidate describing the research program, including an account of how it arose and has evolved and how it has been productive and can be expected to be so into the future, must be included in the file. A rating of Excellent requires, second, that the candidate's total scholarly record be measured by the kind of evidence outlined in Appendix A and including especially the existence of high quality externally-reviewed publications. Finally, Excellence requires that the candidate demonstrate progress toward developing a national and/or international

reputation in his or her field(s) of specialization. Further detail on the evaluation of research performance is described in Appendix A.

ii. Teaching – A Good level of performance in this area is demonstrated by meeting three criteria. First, the candidate's overall teaching record must be deemed to have achieved a rating of Good, taking into account a multiplicity of relevant evidence as described in Appendix B. Second, the candidate must demonstrate that he or she is committed to teaching by including in the file a written statement describing his or her teaching philosophy and practice, and how he or she has endeavored to improve that practice over time. Finally, the candidate will, ordinarily, have a record establishing that he or she has offered a range of courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels, and has offered service/core courses within the Department; significant deviations from any of these ordinary requirements must be addressed and justified in the candidate's written statement describing his or her teaching philosophy and practice. Further detail on the evaluation of teaching performance is described in Appendix B.

iii. Service -- The candidate will have established a Good record of service by demonstrating the ability and willingness to engage in service activities within the Department, the wider University, and for professional organizations. The quality of a candidate's service performance will be an important factor in the evaluation of the candidate's service contribution. Recognition will be accorded for contributions to the community, the state, or the nation, but only if they are broadly related to teaching and research. Evidence relevant to the assessment of quality is described in Appendix C.

b. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor -- The faculty member will normally hold the earned doctor's degree. The candidate's entire professional career will be assessed, but emphasis will be placed on development while serving in the rank of Associate Professor. If hired from another institution in which the candidate held a tenure-track or tenure position as an Associate Professor, there is no minimum time of service at USC before promotion to Professor can be considered. The candidate will have made significant contributions to his or her field. An Outstanding level of performance must be demonstrated in the category of research/scholarship; an Excellent level of performance in teaching and a Good level of performance in service are also required. The Department recognizes that in certain sub-fields, a stronger contribution in the service component may be considered.

i. Research/Scholarship -- Outstanding performance in this area is demonstrated by meeting three criteria. First, the candidate must demonstrate the existence of a sustained program of research oriented to or guided by a significant set of theoretical and substantive issues in his or her field(s) of specialization. In this respect, a written statement by the candidate describing the research program, including an account of how it arose and has evolved and how it has been productive and can be expected to be so into the future, must be included in the file. A rating of Outstanding requires, second, that the candidate's total scholarly record be measured by the kind of evidence outlined in Appendix A and including especially the existence of high quality externally-reviewed publications. Finally, being Outstanding requires that the candidate has achieved a national and/or international reputation in his or her field(s) of specialization.

ii. Teaching – An Excellent level of performance in this area is demonstrated by meeting three criteria. First, the candidate's overall teaching record must be deemed Excellent, taking into account a multiplicity of relevant evidence as described in Appendix B. Second, the candidate must demonstrate that he or she is committed to teaching by including in the file a written statement describing his or her teaching philosophy and practice, and how he or she has endeavored to improve that practice over time. Finally, the candidate will, ordinarily, have a record establishing that he or she has offered a range of courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels, and has offered service/core courses within the

Department; significant deviations from any of these ordinary requirements must be addressed and justified in the candidate's written statement describing his or her teaching philosophy and practice.

iii. Service -- The candidate will have established a record of Good service comparable to the average service record of the full professors of the Political Science Department -- the ability and willingness to engage in service activities within the Department, the wider University, and for professional organizations. The quality of a candidate's service performance will be an important factor in the evaluation of the candidate's service contribution. Recognition will be accorded for contributions to the community, the state, or the nation, but only if they are broadly related to teaching and research. Evidence relevant to the assessment of quality is described in Appendix C.

3. Tenure

The criteria for tenure at the rank of Associate Professor are the same as the criteria for promotion to Associate Professor. The criteria for tenure at the rank of Professor are the same as the criteria for promotion to Professor. Individuals hired at either the Associate or Professor level from outside the University may be required to serve a probationary period before a decision on tenure is taken; the maximum probationary period for Associate Professor or Professor is six years, as stated in the Faculty Manual (revision December 13, 2011). During this period, the individual must demonstrate a record of continued performance at the level necessary for tenure as defined above.

4. Weight of Factors

In all decisions on tenure and promotion, the area of Research/Scholarship shall be given the most weight in the overall evaluation, the area of Teaching shall be weighted as second in importance, and the area of Service shall be weighted as third in importance.

B. Procedures on Tenure and Promotion

1. The Department Chair will notify all eligible candidates at the beginning of each academic year of the Tenure and Promotion Calendar for that academic year. Candidates approaching the end of their probationary period must be notified in the semester prior to department consideration for tenure and promotion. The Department Chair will discuss questions of eligibility with each candidate, as necessary and appropriate. The Department Chair shall also be responsible for calling meetings of the tenured faculty.
2. On all tenure and promotion nominations, every member of the Department, regardless of rank or tenure status is invited to submit recommendations to the Department Chair.
3. Candidates will be responsible for the preparation of their files for review and the submission of documentary evidence relating to departmental criteria. Files will be prepared by candidates in full accordance with requirements of the University Committee on Tenure and Promotion. The file will include a listing of the materials in the file, signed by the candidate. It will also include a copy of the Departmental Tenure & Promotion Criteria, signed by the candidate. Outside referees shall be chosen by the Department Chair in consultation with the tenured members of the Department. The candidate may identify in writing potential reviewers he/she prefers not be selected, and such opposition shall be considered by the tenured faculty of appropriate rank. At least six referees will be contacted and supplied with copies of the University and Department policies, the candidate's vita, and representative

publications selected by the candidate. All letters received from referees will become a part of the candidate's file.

4. In consultation with the candidate, a select committee of five faculty members will be appointed by the Department Chair. The select committee shall assist the candidate in ensuring that his/her file is as complete as possible, summarize for the Committee-of-the-Whole, in writing, the contents of the file, and make a recommendation to the Committee-of-the-Whole, including a justification. The Department Chair shall not serve on the five-member select committee.

5. Members of the Committee-of-the-Whole are responsible for thoroughly examining the file of each candidate, including reading available publications, and will initial the file to indicate that this responsibility has been met.

6. The appropriate tenured faculty of the Department will meet as a Committee-of-the-Whole, and will select a Tenure and Promotion Committee Chair who will chair the meeting (normally the chair of the five-member select committee noted in point 4 above). The Committee-of-the-Whole will vote subsequently by secret ballot on those candidates for tenure and/or promotion. A favorable recommendation by the Department requires two-thirds majority of the valid votes cast by the eligible faculty. A valid vote is one that has been accompanied by a written justification. Abstentions must also be justified. All tenured faculty will receive ballots and are eligible to vote, whether on campus or not, or on leave. Proxy votes shall not be permitted. Only the total of positive and negative votes cast will be used in determining the required two-thirds vote, though abstentions shall also be recorded by the Department Chair. Note: The spouse/partner of a candidate is not eligible to participate, in any form, at any stage of the promotion/tenure process.

7. The tenured full Professors of the Department will vote by secret ballot on candidates for tenure at and/or promotion to the rank of Professor. Recommendation by the Department requires a two-thirds majority of the valid votes cast, not counting abstentions. All full Professors will receive ballots and are eligible to vote, whether on campus or not, or on leave. Proxy votes shall not be permitted. Abstentions must be recorded by the Department Chair.

8. All candidates at all levels will be notified by the Department Chair of the Department's recommendation in their cases and of the Department Chair's recommendation.

9. In the event of a negative decision the Department Chair will meet with the candidate to explain the basis for the recommendation. The candidate has the right to appeal the decision according to the guidelines in the Faculty Manual. Such appeal shall be reported by the Department Chair to the Committee-of-the-Whole.

10. The Department Chair shall not cast a vote along with the members of the Committee-of-the-Whole but shall make known his/her recommendation on the candidate in a letter to be made part of the candidate's file, and in the appropriate places on the University P/T forms. In this letter, the Department Chair shall provide as extensive a justification of his/her evaluation of the candidate as is feasible.

11. Members of the Department will be informed of the overall result of the vote, and the Department Chair's recommendation. Any candidate not recommended by the Committee-of-the-Whole will be identified to the Dean. Failure to recommend is without prejudice with respect to future consideration. The complete vita and supporting files of all candidates recommended for tenure and/or promotion will be forwarded to the Dean.

12. Faculty with Joint Appointments. The criteria for granting tenure or promotion to a jointly appointed faculty member shall be those of the primary unit. For faculty holding joint appointments, each secondary unit must be given an opportunity to propose outside evaluators and to comment on evaluators proposed by the primary unit. An evaluation must be solicited from at least one evaluator nominated or approved by each secondary unit.

If Political Science serves as the secondary unit for one or more faculty members with joint appointments, the views of all faculty eligible to participate in evaluation of the candidate will be solicited and provided for inclusion in the candidate's file, as a summary of faculty comments.

If Political Science serves as the primary unit for one or more faculty members with joint appointments, the secondary department or program will be asked to provide a list of appropriate outside evaluators at the same time that the Political Science faculty are consulted for names of outside evaluators. The chair or director of the outside unit will have the same access to the candidate's file as the five member Political Science committee. Members of the secondary unit at the appropriate rank will be invited to review the candidate's file and the committee report at the same time the file is made available to the Political Science faculty. The chair/director and eligible faculty of the secondary unit will be invited to submit formal input to the candidate's file (placed in the candidate's file at least five working days prior to deadline for the Political Science vote on the candidate).

Similar procedures, as appropriately modified, should also be followed in regard to the Third Year Review and the Post-Tenure Review of faculty with joint appointments.

In the event that Political Science and another unit agree on a joint appointment, Political Science should ask for a memorandum of understanding (MOU). The MOU should include (1) identification of the tenuring unit; (2) teaching responsibilities and expectations, including split of teaching load between the primary and secondary units; (3) formula and criteria for sharing indirect cost return (IDCR) among the units; and (4) service responsibility load and split between the units. The MOU should include signatures of the jointly appointed faculty member, the unit heads of the primary and secondary units, the deans of the colleges in the units reside, and the provost. The teaching load for a joint appointment should not be greater than for a faculty member of the same rank in the primary unit. The service load for a joint appointment should be comparable to normal service load of a faculty member of the same rank in the primary unit.

Appendix A

Representative list of evidence for the evaluation of research/scholarship:

1. Authored books and monographs. Work published by distinguished presses is indicative of high quality.
2. Refereed articles. Refereed articles appearing in the leading scholarly journals, including those of the candidate's field(s) of specialization, are indicative of high quality.
3. Awards based on research/scholarship and publications.
4. Edited books and chapters in edited collections. Collections containing contributions by leading scholars in the candidate's field(s) of specialization are considered indicative of high quality.
5. Letters from external referees. These letters, which are required as part of a candidate's tenure and/or promotion file, should be submitted by prominent scholars. They are important indicators of quality and reputation.
6. Successful application for competitive externally- and internally-funded research.
7. Professional papers and non-refereed publications and reports. Such work is evidence of ongoing research/scholarship and may indicate high quality if, for instance, it leads to refereed publications in leading journals or by distinguished presses.
8. Reviews of published work and pre-publication reviews of works in press. High praise by leading scholars is indicative of high quality.
9. Affirmative acknowledgment of published work by other scholars. High praise by leading scholars and frequent citation by others are indicators of high quality.
10. The growth and extent of scholarly reputation may also be indicated by various professional service activities (see Appendix C).
11. Publications from the doctoral dissertation will be considered as evidence of research/scholarship, but by itself such publication is not sufficient for promotion. There must also be clear indications that significant, independent scholarship going beyond the dissertation has been undertaken.
12. Should much of a candidate's work be co-authored, scrutiny must be given to the question of the candidate's individual contribution. As with all candidates, the requirement that significant independent scholarship has been undertaken must be demonstrated. Because there is no accepted norm in Political Science regarding the importance of the order of co-authors, normally co-authors will be contacted to provide a statement on the nature of collaboration/co-authorship with the candidate.

Appendix B

The assessment of teaching must reflect a holistic judgment. This includes evidence of a candidate's commitment to teaching as reflected in his/her self-described teaching philosophy and practice; evidence that the candidate has ordinarily taught both undergraduate and graduate courses and service/core courses; and evidence that the candidate has secured either a Good or Excellent level of teaching performance as measured by a multiplicity of relevant indicators. With respect to these indicators, identified below, none can alone be decisive. Instead, judgment of performance level is to be based on three equally weighted components of these indicators: peer reviews, student evaluations, and other indicators.

Peer reviews. Peer reviews of candidates must document a history of consistent or rising effectiveness in the classroom in order to be judged Good. In order to be judged Excellent, peer reviews must document consistent effectiveness.

Student evaluations.

Assistant Professors going up for the rank of Associate Professor must demonstrate that at least half of the total number of students they have taught combining all courses agreed on the student evaluation form that their class was "good" or better (i.e. 3 or higher on the quantitative scale). If this standard is not achieved the candidate will need to offer additional compelling evidence of quality teaching using other indicators discussed in this document.

Associate Professors going up for the rank of Full Professor must demonstrate that at least half of the total number of students they have taught combining all courses agreed on the student evaluation form that their class was "good" or better (i.e. 3 or higher on the quantitative scale). If this standard is not achieved the candidate will need to offer additional compelling evidence of quality teaching using other indicators discussed in this document.

Other indicators. In order to be judged Good, candidates must meet at least three of the following indicators of teaching performance; in order to be judged Excellent, candidates must meet at least five of these indicators.

- Syllabi and course materials reflect a level of sophistication appropriate for the level of the courses taught
- A demonstrated commitment to student advising and mentoring
- Evidence of course revisions that substantially improve previously taught courses
- Creation of new courses that serve the mutual interests of the candidate and the Department
- Evidence of successful experimentation with innovative teaching techniques
- Integration of course work with research, scholarship and field experiences
- Successful direction of and service in regard to undergraduate and graduate student research appropriate to the candidate's rank. (Faculty members at all ranks are eligible to serve on or chair MA thesis or Ph.D. doctoral committees, but junior faculty are not expected to do so.)
- Receipt of a significant teaching award(s)
- Repeated student praise of a candidate's teaching and/or mentoring independent of student classroom evaluations, e.g., in written correspondence or other forms of documented student feedback
- Publication of textbooks, and/or of monographs or articles on teaching
- Participation in teaching workshops and seminars

Appendix C

Representative list of evidence for the evaluation of performance in service:

(The following list is not meant to be in any specific order of priority, nor is it to be considered exhaustive in regard to the evidence of performance in service. No individual is expected to demonstrate evidence of performance in service relating to all of the following.)

Service to the Profession

1. Serving as an officer in local, regional, national, or international professional organizations.
2. Serving as an editor or as an active member of an editorial board for scholarly presses and professional journals.
3. Serving on a professional program committee.
4. Serving as a review board member for grant proposals.
5. Serving as a review board member for accreditation associations.
6. Serving as an active participant in professional organizational meetings and activities.
7. Organizing meetings, symposia, conferences, and workshops.
8. Reviewing manuscripts for professional journals.
9. Serving as the editor of professional organization publications, newsletters, etc.
10. Serving as an external referee for presses, journals, promotion and tenure cases at other universities.

Service to the Department and University

1. Committee service
2. Participation on councils and senates
3. Administrative appointments
4. Non-released time service in university units.
5. Special assignments undertaken at the request of the administration.
6. Work with student organizations.
7. Work on campus-wide programs and activities.

Public Service

1. Involvement in professionally-related public organizations, agencies, and commissions.
2. Participation in media and public education activities.
3. Consulting activities with public organizations, consistent with University regulations regarding compensation and performance.
4. Active involvement in community civic and service organizations.
5. Offering classes, special workshops or seminars outside of the university.