

Department of Political Science Bylaws

Approved: July 23, 2001

Amended: March 13, 2009

Amended: December 10, 2012

Contents:

Article 1: Membership

All full-time faculty members of Wright State University with appointments in the Department of Political Science are voting members of the department.

Article 2: Organization

1. The department faculty will use department meetings to make recommendations for decision-making. All recommendations of the department faculty shall be made by simple majority vote. Conduct of the meetings of the department, and those of its committees, may be informal, but in case of dispute over procedure, Robert's Rules of Order must be followed. Except as noted in section 2D below, the department may act as a committee of the whole on all matters.
2. A meeting of the department faculty shall be called at least once each term from August to May by the chair of the department. The chair shall also call additional meetings as necessary. A meeting of the department shall be called whenever four members of the department request it.
3. An agenda for the meeting shall be published, by the chair, at least 48 hours before the meeting, either electronically or in paper form, to all members of the department. Members should suggest items to the chair prior to this time. A quorum for the meeting is defined as a majority of the bargaining unit faculty in the department. Written minutes of the meeting shall be kept.
4. At the last meeting of the academic year, standing committees of the department shall be elected for the following academic year. The size and composition of any committee, except the promotion and tenure committee, shall be decided by a majority of the department members present and voting. The following are the standing committees of the department:
 - a. Promotion and Tenure: The promotion and Tenure Committee shall evaluate all candidates for promotion and tenure and submit a recommendation on each case, using the criteria and procedures identified in Article 6 of this document. All tenured members of the department are eligible to serve on this committee. Only full professors in the department are eligible to evaluate and vote on candidates for promotion to Full Professor. If there are not three (3) professors eligible to vote, then one or more additional full professors from other departments shall be selected by the chair, the candidate(s) and the Promotion and Tenure Committee. This committee is also responsible for making an annual report on the progress of untenured members of the department toward promotion and tenure, and on the progress of tenured assistant and associate professors toward promotion.
 - b. Faculty Development: The Faculty Development committee is responsible for:
 - i. Making recommendations about the performance of each faculty member for the previous year according to the procedures and criteria outlined in Article 5 of this document and
 - ii. Making recommendations to the chair on the support and mentoring of department members.

- iii. Making recommendations on the nomination and election of department members to college committees and the college senate.
 - c. Scheduling: The Scheduling Committee shall advise the chair on teaching schedules and Summer Teaching according to the provisions of these by-laws in Article 7.
5. The chair may, from time to time, or as recommended by the department faculty, form other committees as the need may arise.

Article 3: The Chair

When, for any reason, a vacancy exists in the position of department chair, the department faculty shall be convened by the senior bargaining unit faculty member of the department as defined by length of service in the department, for the purposes of discussing, and transmitting to the Dean, recommendations on the appointment of a chair.

The senior bargaining unit faculty member will confer with the dean on how to provide recommendations from the faculty to the dean on the appointment of a new chair. This may involve a department meeting, individual interviews, or both.

Article 4: Recruitment of Faculty

1. The department faculty has a major role in this process by recommending the responsibilities of the position to be filled; reviewing credentials; interviewing applicants; and recommending a person or persons to be hired within the department. The department shall vote on what recommendations to make to the Dean.
2. The chair will convene a committee for carrying out the above faculty responsibilities in hiring, and shall forward the recommendations of the department faculty to the Dean, along with his or her recommendations.

Article 5: Development and Evaluation of Bargaining Unit Faculty

1. A major responsibility of the department faculty is to assist the chair in the mentoring and assistance of all faculty, especially non-tenured faculty, in their teaching and scholarship. The principal means by which this is accomplished is through annual evaluation of each member.
2. Each year, the department chair evaluates every member of the faculty on the basis of teaching, scholarship and service. In the Department of Political Science, teaching and scholarship are regarded as equally important, and are thus weighted equally. Service is rated as only half as important as teaching and scholarship, and is thus weighted accordingly. Thus any person's overall rating would consist of a 40% teaching component, 40% scholarship component, and a 20% service component. However, standard weights can be adjusted by the chair for faculty with non-standard responsibilities. Any department member may request adjusted weighting to better reflect his/her activities for the year to be evaluated, or longer if the faculty member is on Professional Development Leave. Normally, such adjusted weighting will be within the following ranges:

Teaching - 20% to 50%
Scholarship - 20% to 50%
Service - 20% to 50%

Weighting changes determined by the chair will be used in the annual evaluation in these cases.

3. Each bargaining unit faculty member is required by the collective bargaining agreement to be given a numerical rating each year, by the chair, in each of the three categories. These ratings, and their definitions, are as follows:

a. The Evaluation of Teaching

i. Criteria for the Evaluation of Teaching

To receive a score of 1 (Adequate) in teaching, a faculty member must teach an assigned course load and advise students in a satisfactory fashion, absent a clear pattern of symptoms noted in the category of Unsatisfactory (below).

To receive a score of 2 (Meritorious) in teaching, a faculty member must effectively teach an assigned course load and effectively advise students, as demonstrated in peer assessment and student evaluations, with specific reference to evaluation questions addressing student learning outcomes and evidence of instructor preparation..

To receive a score of 3 (Outstanding) in teaching, a faculty member must teach an assigned course load, and perform three of the following well, as demonstrated in student evaluations and peer evaluation:

- Advise students effectively, for example, being available during office hours and accurately explaining program requirements.
- Show significant evidence of genuine success in teaching and advising, such as advisees' timely graduation, or admission to graduate or law school, or lack of complaints in evaluations, or positive student comments in teaching evaluations.
- Perform other teaching-related functions effectively and responsibly as requested; e.g., advise honors students, supervise master's theses, serve on thesis and portfolio committees, supervise independent-study students, etc.
- Develop new courses or significantly revise existing courses, or integrate computer technologies into classes in a meaningful way, or the equivalent.

To receive a score of 4 (Extraordinary) in teaching, a faculty member must teach an assigned load effectively and perform at least four of the following with distinction:

- Advise students effectively.
- Show clear and convincing evidence of special commitment to and outstanding success in teaching and advising, or the equivalent, such as advisees' timely graduation, or admission to graduate or law school, or lack of complaints in evaluations, or positive student comments in teaching evaluations.
- Perform other teaching-related functions effectively and responsibly as requested; e.g., advise honors students and thesis candidates, serve on thesis committees, supervise independent-study students, or the equivalent.
- Develop new courses or significantly revise existing courses, or integrate computer technologies into classes in a meaningful way, or the equivalent.
- Take a leadership role in the development and support of the teaching of other department faculty (especially of bargaining-unit faculty), e.g., by giving classes on pedagogical issues, by leading the way and helping others with classroom technology, by mentoring faculty who may be struggling with their teaching, by developing on-line courses that meet department needs and standards, or the equivalent.

- Have extensive responsibility for a significant portion of the political science curriculum. For example, teaching eight different topical courses within a three year period.
- Direct a master's thesis or project or serve on multiple thesis committees or supervise multiple independent studies or field experiences.
- Receive an award for teaching and/or advising excellence.

A score of 0 (Unsatisfactory) in teaching will be given to any faculty member who does not satisfy the requirements for an Adequate evaluation or who does not provide the Chair the evidence required for the Chair's evaluation. Symptoms of "unsatisfactory" teaching performance may include (but are not limited to)

- missed classes (without informing the department or without adequate explanation),
- missed advising appointments,
- persistent legitimate student complaints,
- erratic classroom behavior,
- failure to keep appropriate office hours and otherwise be available to students and advisees.
- failure or refusal to provide the Chair information, materials, or notification required by the Contract.
- failure to communicate with students.
- refusal to teach assigned courses in the faculty member's field.
- refusal to teach standard assigned writing and general-education courses for which department faculty are normally responsible.
- failure to respond appropriately to reasonable student questions or complaints.
- irresponsible or unprofessional conduct with or in the presence of students in a university setting.

Behaviors like those described may result in an evaluation of "unsatisfactory" (if they are frequent and characteristic) or a lowered evaluation (from meritorious to satisfactory, for example).

ii. Evidence for the Evaluation of Teaching

Student evaluations of teaching are required of all bargaining unit faculty. Peer evaluations of teaching are required of all untenured bargaining unit faculty and may sometimes be conducted for tenured faculty.

Peer Evaluations. The Political Science Promotion and Tenure Committee must annually review non-tenured bargaining unit faculty in selected courses. Peer reviews of a tenured faculty member will be performed at the request of the Chair of the Department, the Promotion and Tenure Committee, or that individual faculty member. For untenured faculty, the courses selected for review will be determined by mutual agreement between the faculty member and the committee. If no agreement can be reached, the candidate will select two courses and the committee will select two courses for review. Ideally, faculty should have their faculty peers review courses at different levels, if possible courses of different kinds, showing the range of the faculty member's teaching abilities. In the years in which faculty write formal reviews, they are due to the Chair no later than the date on which the report of teaching, scholarship, and service is due. Owing to the delicate position in which

probationary faculty find themselves, only faculty who have been tenured will be required to conduct peer evaluations of the type described under paragraph 1) below. Tenure-eligible faculty may serve on the Faculty Development Committee and assist with peer evaluations as described in paragraph 2). And tenure-eligible faculty may also serve in the small review groups as described in paragraph 3).

The department faculty will conduct peer evaluations of teaching in two different ways.

- In the first method of peer evaluation of teaching, bargaining-unit faculty will arrange in advance to visit the classes of their colleagues. Before the visit, they should arrange to discuss the class, specifically the class goals, the content that will be discussed, the skills that will be encouraged, and the teaching methods that will be employed. Following the visit, the visiting peer reviewer will write a memo addressing the effectiveness of the teaching in the context of the course's goals, content, skills and methods
- In the other method of peer evaluation of teaching, bargaining-unit faculty will form small groups, to be recommended by the Faculty Development Committee. Each group will review selected syllabuses and course materials for each faculty member in the group. The group evaluation may include classroom visits. At the end of the year, the review group will write a memo evaluating each faculty member's teaching, based on its evaluation of course materials and on other information.

During the fall semester of each year, the Faculty Development Committee will decide which methods of peer evaluation will be used the following year.

Student Evaluations. The contract specifies what part of the student evaluations will be sent to the faculty member only and what information will be sent to the Chair.

Other Evidence. Student evaluations and peer evaluations alone can support a claim of Adequate, Meritorious or Outstanding performance in teaching. Faculty wishing to make a case for Extraordinary teaching effectiveness should submit additional evidence to the department Chair. Supporting evidence may include (but is not limited to) the following:

- Selected syllabuses or other class materials (to demonstrate a particular classroom innovation, for example).
- A written response to one or more of the required peer evaluations.
- A description of a particular section or a response to the student evaluations for a particular section (if the faculty member believes the evaluations for that section need to be contextualized, for example).
- Additional student evaluation materials, including (but not limited to) a self-administered evaluation instrument, a mid-term evaluation, the numerical evaluations from the official university instrument, signed letter(s) from students in a particular course, etc.
- Evidence showing student learning success, for example the results of a pre- and post-evaluation.

- b. The Evaluation of Scholarship
 - i. Criteria for the Evaluation of Scholarship

The Political Science Department values research and scholarship, and fully understands that real scholarship often bears fruit only after a researcher spends a considerable time preparing the ground. Thus, in determining merit in scholarship, the Chair should not only weigh the scholarship itself but the time and effort of preparation. (Collaborative scholarship normally requires as much effort as single-author scholarship and should be evaluated accordingly.) In particular, the department encourages the Chair to look beyond the work of the single year to get a sense of the faculty member's overall performance as a scholar. Similarly, we encourage all faculty to give the Chair materials which will help him/her accurately judge merit using a broader perspective than that of a single year. However, the department agrees that higher levels of merit in scholarship, particularly the rankings of "Outstanding" and "Extraordinary," will normally require scholarship of the kind described below.

To receive a score of 1 (Adequate) in scholarship, a faculty member must

- Keep current with scholarship in an appropriate professional field.
- Demonstrate that currency by attending a conference, chairing a panel, delivering local lecture(s) or presentation(s) on ongoing research, engaging actively in ongoing research and writing, or the equivalent.

To receive a score of 2 (Meritorious) in scholarship, a faculty member must

- Keep current with scholarship in an appropriate professional field.
- Demonstrate that currency by attending a conference, chairing a panel, delivering local lecture(s) or presentation(s) on ongoing research, engaging actively in ongoing research and writing, or the equivalent.
- Go beyond the demonstration of scholarly competence by delivering a paper at a significant academic conference, publishing one or several reviews, preparing an article or articles for a reference work, editing an academic series, or the equivalent.

To receive a score of 3 (Outstanding) in scholarship, a faculty member must

- Keep current with scholarship in an appropriate professional field.
- Demonstrate that currency by any two of the following, for example attending a conference, chairing a panel, delivering lecture(s) or presentation(s) on ongoing research, engaging actively in ongoing research and writing, publishing one or several reviews, preparing an article or articles for a reference work, receiving a funded research grant, or the equivalent.
- Go beyond the demonstration of scholarly competence by delivering a paper at a significant academic conference, publishing one or several reviews, preparing an article or articles for a reference work, editing an academic series, receiving a contract for the publication of a book, text book or monograph, or the equivalent.
- Demonstrate professional originality and independence, for example by publishing an article in a peer-reviewed academic journal or law review, publishing a chapter in a peer-reviewed academic book, editing or coediting a peer-reviewed academic book with a recognized university or academic press, revising and republishing a previously published book or textbook,

revising and collecting previously published work in a single volume, or the equivalent.

To receive a score of 4 (Extraordinary) in scholarship, a faculty member must do at least one of the following fully or some partial combination of at least two of the following, or the equivalent, in addition to otherwise keeping at least an Adequate or Meritorious level of scholarly activity:

- Publish a peer-reviewed academic book with a recognized university or academic press.
- Publish a professional textbook with a recognized publisher of texts in the appropriate field.
- Publish two or more professional articles in peer-reviewed academic journals or law reviews.
- Publish two or more chapters in an edited book.

A score of 0 (Unsatisfactory) in scholarship will be given to any faculty member who cannot satisfy the requirements for a Satisfactory evaluation. Symptoms of "unsatisfactory" scholarly performance include (but are not limited to) demonstrations of incompetence in matters of professional expertise, periods of four or more years without a professional publication of any kind, reluctance or refusal to respond to mentoring or to develop a research plan (if requested), and so on.

ii. Evidence for the Evaluation of Scholarship

Faculty may claim a work for the purposes of merit (above the level of "Adequate") in more than one year. For example, an article or manuscript may be reported in year one as being "in preparation" or "under consideration;" in year two it may be reported as having been "accepted" or "under contract;" in year three it may be reported as being "published." It is useful for faculty to list all three in order to establish their ongoing commitment to keeping current with their professional fields.

In support of all claims of merit in scholarship at the "Meritorious" level and above, the faculty member must submit the following:

- For all published works: a copy of the publication.
- For all works listed as accepted but not yet published: a printed copy of the accepted manuscript or galley proofs of the printed publication.
- For all conference papers: a printed copy of the manuscript.

In addition, all faculty may (if they wish) submit a statement describing their research program and publication plans, as a way of placing in context the performance for a given year

c. The Evaluation of Service

i. Criteria for the Evaluation of Service

Faculty service that is most valued contributes to the overall mission of the department, the discipline, college, university, or community. Service includes but is not limited to committee service, leadership in existing university programs, and development of new programs and initiatives.

Activity including at least two of the following will be typical of an Adequate level of service and will receive a score of 1:

- Serve on one or two committees at the department level and/or at the college or university level; attend regular department meetings.
- Respond to requests for activity reports, workload plans, etc., in a timely fashion.
- Serve as a reviewer for the purposes of peer evaluation of teaching.
- Perform some community or professional service related to professional expertise.

Activity including at least two of the following will be typical of a Meritorious level of service and will receive a score of 2:

- Chair an important department committee or serve on two or more important department committees or committees at the college or university level or the equivalent,
- Serve on two or more other department committees and/or committees at the college or university level or the equivalent,
- Take a leadership role in some aspect of university work, e.g., in assisting with a search, in developing a new course, in evaluating required texts for a course, in leading an assessment activity for the department or the university, in developing a student-centered activity, or the equivalent,
- Respond to requests for activity reports, workload plans, etc. in a timely fashion,
- Serve as a reviewer for the purposes of peer evaluation of teaching,
- Perform some community or professional service related to professional expertise.

In addition to maintaining an otherwise Meritorious level of service, activity like the following, at least fully in one category or some partial combination of two or more categories, will be typical of an Outstanding level of service and will receive a score of 3:

- Lead a major aspect of the department's academic life beyond the regular activities of teaching, advising, and service; for example, lead a student organization, direct a departmental or interdepartmental program, lead a search, chair an important and productive committee or the equivalent,
- Take a leadership role in an important aspect of college or university governance or organization; for example, chair a committee that rewrites and implements changes in general education or develops a new degree program, take a leadership role in faculty governance, or the equivalent,
- Take a leadership role in a state or national professional or international organization, or function in a central capacity in the publication of a professional journal, or the equivalent.
- Be in charge of an academic program within or outside of the department. For example, serve as the director of the International Studies Program or the Graduate Program.

To receive a score of 4 (Extraordinary) in service, a faculty member must perform some combination of outstanding activities in three areas of service or produce a major impact in one area.

ii. Evidence for the Evaluation of Service

Faculty should submit to the chair

- A list of all service activities performed during the year, arranged in order from the most important to the least important.
- A description of all service activities performed that represent special commitment or effort beyond the norm.
- Any testimonial letters received that describe a particular act of service and its effects.- Any other material that may support a claim to merit in service above that of "meritorious."

Article 6: Promotion and Tenure of Faculty

1. In the Department of Political Science, the primary responsibility for securing a recommendation for Promotion and/or Tenure rests with the individual seeking promotion and/or tenure.
2. The responsibilities and procedures for applying for Promotion and/or Tenure are contained in Article 13 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.
3. Criteria for promotion and tenure.

In those exceptional cases of associate and full professors hired without tenure, specific, reasonable and consistent criteria for tenure must be prepared by the faculty development committee in consultation and agreement with the chair, the Dean, the faculty governance committee and the candidate.

- a. A recommendation from the department for promotion or tenure must be based on objective criteria regarding teaching, scholarship, and service, and shall take into account letters of assessment from external reviewers.
- b. For promotion to Associate Professor
 - i. **Teaching:** Over the probationary period the candidate should have compiled a record of consistently effective or steadily improving teaching and advising. At least at the end of the probationary period, there should be strong evidence of successful teaching, which normally includes strong student demand for upper level elective courses, strong student and peer evaluations, or other evidence submitted by the candidate. Finally, there should be strong evidence that the faculty member has contributed to the teaching mission of the department.

Extraordinarily good teaching can be weighed against, but not entirely make up for, a less strong record of scholarship. But the opposite is not true. The life blood of the department is good teaching, and thus the department will not recommend a poor teacher for promotion no matter how good, or how extensive, his or her research may be.

- ii. **Scholarship:** Published scholarship, possibly supplemented with other unpublished scholarly work such as conference papers or service on conference panels, in Political Science is necessary for promotion and tenure in the department. The discipline of Political Science here is defined to include subfields such as public law,

criminal justice, and political psychology, as well as other subfields recognized by the American Political Science Association or contained within the department's course curriculum. This scholarship may take many forms, but in general must be evidence of an ongoing program of research, submission and publication of work and professional involvement in the discipline. It must also strongly include work done while a member of the department of political science at Wright State University. (Although credit for publications based on research done prior to appointment at Wright State will be given consideration in the recommendation, evidence of ongoing scholarship while at Wright State University must be present in the record.)

General practice in the department is that a candidate with four peer-reviewed scholarly articles (at least two published while at Wright State University) in well-respected, scholarly, refereed journals or law reviews, or their equivalents as determined by the department, would merit strong consideration for recommendation for promotion, assuming all other criteria were met.

Collaborative scholarship normally requires as much effort as individual scholarship and shall be evaluated accordingly.

There can be no exact formula to secure a recommendation for promotion in regard to published scholarship. Each case will be different. Some candidates will have many items; others will have few. In essence, the fewer the items published, the higher the quality of the work, or the journal in which the work is published, is expected to be.

As an example, one candidate may secure a recommendation from the department by publishing consistently in refereed journals, books or law reviews. Another candidate may be successful by publishing a highly regarded book based on research done during the probationary period, participation at meetings, demonstration of significant submission of peer-reviewed grant proposals, such as a Title VI grant proposal, or have limited or even no other published research beyond the previously mentioned highly regarded book. (Although this latter strategy would be deemed risky by the department, and the candidate would usually be counseled against doing it). And, as noted above, a relatively weaker record of publication may be weighed against a demonstrably extraordinary record of teaching, in rare circumstances.

In short, to secure a recommendation from the department for promotion and tenure, a candidate should have substantial evidence of a continued commitment to serious scholarship, coupled with proof of peer acceptance by the publication of his or her scholarly work.

- iii. **Service:** Candidates for promotion to Associate Professor are not expected, nor are they encouraged, to have extensive involvement in service. A demonstrated willingness to participate in and render departmental or college or university or community service is expected for promotion, but in no case will it substitute for deficiencies in teaching and/or research.
- c. For Promotion to Full Professor

Promotion to Full Professor is the culmination of an academic career. It involves excellence in all areas of evaluation. There is no exact time frame for recommendation to this rank.

- i. **Teaching:** Full professors should not only be excellent teachers, but should also be role models for others in the department. They should have extensive responsibility for a significant portion of the political science curriculum or be in charge of academic programs within and outside of the department. In general they should be known as the expert, or one of the experts in their teaching field at Wright State University.
- ii. **Scholarship:** The scholarship requirements for Full Professor in the department of political science go well beyond the walls of the university. For recommendation to the rank of Full Professor, a candidate should present evidence of achievements since her/his promotion to Associate Professor which have been evaluated positively by her/his peers in their given field. Evidence may include the publication of a book or at least four substantial articles in refereed journals or law reviews or their equivalents as determined by the department. The candidate should also demonstrate participation at national and/or international academic conferences, or citation of published works in books or scholarly publications in major journals, or the award of major research grants.
- iii. **Service:** For recommendation to Full Professor, a candidate should show evidence of continuing substantial service on behalf of the university, such as faculty governance, as committee chair, member of the Faculty Senate, or AAUP representative. Mentoring and leadership of student organizations over a long period of time is also an indicator of successful recommendation. The service record should point to specific accomplishments in service roles.

Work in the community at large is also an important aspect of service for full professors. Examples may include commentary in the media, leadership roles on boards of local organizations, professional organizations, journal editorial boards, and contributions to successful community initiatives.

Finally, the candidate for full professor should show sustained commitment to all three areas prior to seeking a recommendation from the department.

- d. **Tenure Without Promotion:** The Department of Political Science will not recommend a probationary (assistant professor) faculty member for tenure without promotion.

Article 7: Teaching Assignments

The scheduling committee will, from time to time, meet with the chair to make recommendations on scheduling of classes and Summer assignments. Among guidelines that should be considered are the professional and personal responsibilities of the members of the department. Of special note is the necessity of junior members to compile a significant publishing record.

Article 8: Summer Teaching Rotation

If sufficient summer courses are not scheduled so that all bargaining unit faculty members who wish to may teach two classes, summer teaching assignments shall then occur in accordance with a rotation system based on length of service in the department. A list of department faculty in order of their rotation shall be maintained and updated every Fall semester, adding any new members of the department. The rotation list shall be circulated among all department faculty members.

In order of priority each person shall be offered one section. After each eligible person has been assigned one section, a second section will be offered in the order of priority.

Individuals declining to teach or persons ineligible for assignment for any reason, hold their numerical position in the rotation order. Faculty denied a summer course assignment move to the top of the order.

Article 9: Amendments

Any amendments to these by-laws must be approved by a majority of the bargaining unit members in the Department of Political Science, by the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, and by the Faculty Governance Committee.