

Department of Political Science

**College of Letters, Arts and Sciences
University of Colorado Colorado Springs**

**Criteria, Standards and Evidence for Reappointment,
Promotion and Tenure**

October 4, 2024

Political Science Department

Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures

Introduction

Standards and processes for reappointment, promotion and tenure of faculty are governed by Article V of the Laws of the Regents. These are further delineated in a series of CU Administrative Policy Statements. Campus guidance is supplied in UCCS Policy #200-001. These documents require the establishment of departmental criteria which are to be used throughout the review process.

Department of Political Science Criteria

These criteria are to be considered guidelines for the general review of candidates toward reappointment, promotion and tenure in the Department of Political Science at the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs. The criteria are based on appropriate and current standards of professional performance in our discipline. Each candidate's case will be reviewed and judged on its individual merits and circumstances. The department is committed to quality teaching, strong research/creative work, and effective service to the university, the profession, and the community. The evaluation process assumes: possession of an appropriate terminal degree; competent education and training in the discipline; conduct which reflects the professional and academic standards for generating, validating, disputing, and transmitting knowledge; and an appreciation of and respect for the rights, duties, and privileges associated with academic freedom and collegial responsibilities.

Tenure Track Promotion and Tenure Criteria:

When these criteria are applied to faculty who were granted time toward tenure, the years granted shall be considered equivalent to work performed at UCCS. While a faculty member's career record will be considered in personnel actions described here, the main emphasis of evaluation will be on work performed at UCCS and, in particular, progress since the last review.

The following guidelines are designed to assist the faculty in implementing the regental standards for reappointment, promotion and tenure and to clarify the conditions under which candidates merit advancement. The department is strongly committed to innovative and effective teaching, to research and scholarship which makes a contribution to the discipline of political science and which positively affects the world both inside and outside the academy, and to service to both the University and the community. At all levels of review, each candidate will submit a dossier, as outlined in the College's "Guidelines for Faculty Personnel Actions" (p. 9).

The Rules of the Regents require that eventually a candidate for tenure and promotion must be evaluated and receive a rating of **meritorious** in all three areas of work (teaching, research, and leadership and service) and an **excellent** rating in at least either teaching or research. The Department of Political Science's standards for a **meritorious** and **excellent** ratings of faculty are listed below. In general, work in progress is an important consideration in evaluating a

candidate during early reappointment processes. It is important to note that the definitions for meritorious and excellent must be based upon progressive accomplishment and, in the case of scholarship, work in print (or work that is verified that will be in print) will be the standard. As permitted in APS 1022, the faculty of the Department of Political Science have voted not to have a vote of the primary unit faculty as a step in the reappointment, promotion, and tenure process

Standards for **Meritorious and Excellent ratings:**

Teaching:

Meritorious Rating:

Evidence of interest in student success, evidence of accessibility to students, and evidence of encouragement of student interests. The candidate should display a record of a reasonable number of the suggested activities listed in the appendix.

A record of the successful teaching of those courses for which the person was hired and additional courses that enrich the course offerings for student majors.

Based upon the needs of the department, a record of the successful teaching of both upper and lower division courses and graduate courses.

Excellent Rating:

Evidence that those criteria for the meritorious rating of teaching have been accomplished plus successful involvement in several of the suggested teaching activities listed in the appendix. To receive a rating of excellent, the faculty member must have a demonstrated achievement at the campus, local, national, and/or international level which furthers the practice and/or scholarship of teaching and learning beyond the candidate's immediate instructional setting. The Political Science department identifies the immediate instructional setting as the place where regular assigned teaching occurs. Thus, any teaching impact at the departmental, campus, or community level demonstrates impacts of teaching and learning beyond the candidate's immediate instructional setting (pp. 1-2)

The candidate is a recipient of the College of Letters, Arts, and Science's and/or the UCCS campus teaching award.

Scholarly Research and Creative Work:

Meritorious Rating:

An ongoing pattern of research activity and the successful publication of the candidate's work in respected books, journal articles, research reports, etc. The publication in peer reviewed journal articles at a rate of about an article per year. If the publication of a book is pursued, the quality of the press will be of importance. Co-authored publications will count as one half a journal article

or one half a book toward promotion or tenure. If the candidate gives evidence that at least 70% of the work is that of the candidate, the entire credit will be awarded to the candidate.

Excellent Rating:

For an excellent rating a candidate should exhibit very strong research in print. By the tenure review this would require 7-8 articles with several published in Tier 1. Alternatively, a book published or forthcoming by a highly respected university or commercial press, with possibly a few articles or book chapters as well, might suffice. Where appropriate, book reviews will be considered as evidence of the quality of published books. Also important in judging excellence will be the evaluation of the publication record by outside peer reviewers. For a rating of excellent there is an expectation of not only publication in quality publications in peer reviewed journals and presses, but some work in journals that political science professionals judge to be top journals and/or presses in our field.

Leadership and Service:

The department recognizes service to the department, the campus, the community and to our profession. Beyond the universally-expected robust engagement in the life of the department, the department recognizes many forms of service that should be supported and rewarded. Service on formal committees, administrative service and participation in faculty governance are important forms of service internal to the campus. Likewise, there are many forms of service to the profession and the community. The department recognizes that some forms of service result in additional compensation for the faculty member, but others do not. We think it is important to recognize both forms of service within the bounds of university policy. The department especially encourages service that results in contributions to diversity, community engagement, and student engagement, retention, and success.

Review Level Evaluations:

Initial Reappointment Review

The candidate's total record, including teaching, research, and leadership and service, shall be evaluated and the record must show sufficient potential of future success to justify reappointment. At this level of review, teaching will normally be the most important element in evaluating faculty performance. In most cases, progress on research and scholarly work will carry more weight than leadership and service which, while important, may be more appropriate for those further along in their careers.

1) Teaching

The candidate's total record, including teaching, research, and leadership and service, shall be evaluated and the record must show sufficient potential of future success to justify reappointment. The candidate's teaching shall be evaluated by multiple means and will include Faculty Course Questionnaires and other means of evaluation. In addition to

classroom teaching, the candidate's work with students outside of the classroom as a mentor, research advisor, independent study director, intern supervisor and similar activities shall be considered here. Other factors to be considered should include the following: performance on faculty course evaluations (including both the numerical scores and the written comments of students), coherence, organization and appropriate content of courses (as evidenced by syllabi, lecture notes, and other materials), professional development as a teacher (as shown by revisions made in courses or plans for revisions, workshops attended, etc.), accessibility to students, and willingness to contribute to the department's curriculum. It is generally expected that the average instructor rating on FCQs will be at least a 5 (B). Each candidate shall submit a teaching portfolio, as part of the dossier, which provides evidence relating to these factors and which will include a statement of teaching approach and teaching plan outlining the candidate's teaching goals over the next 3-5 years.

2) Scholarly Research and Creative Work

The department recognizes that scholarship can take many forms. Our department emphasizes fundamental discovery, scholarly work which integrates existing knowledge, and applied research. We recognize scholarly study of teaching and learning issues in our field as a form of research that has an impact on our discipline. The candidate is expected to demonstrate a well-designed research plan and the potential for continued development as a researcher and progress toward publication. This might include drafts of work in progress, presentations at professional meetings, and/or articles submitted for publication. At this level, candidates should demonstrate progress toward publication. The department, of course, values traditional scholarly research which has an impact on public policy or programs, as well research which has an impact on the discipline. Evidence of progress could, for example, include conference papers presented or accepted for presentation, drafts of articles or book chapters under submission or preparation, research reports submitted to or published by public agencies, research proposals or written descriptions of research in progress, reviews of others' work, serving as a discussant or panel chair at conferences, reviews received from journals or publishers, letters from colleagues evaluating specific work, and other evidence of research activity. For this review, actual publication (in press or in print), especially of work accomplished while at UCCS and particularly refereed journal articles, well-placed book chapters, or other appropriately-screened research shall normally be taken as prima facie evidence of satisfactory progress in this area. As a part of the dossier, each candidate shall submit a research portfolio consisting of examples of the above, a statement of research philosophy and a research plan outlining the candidate's research goals over the next 3-5 years.

3) Leadership and Service

The department recognizes leadership and service to the campus, community, and our profession. At this stage, the candidate is expected to participate fully in the life of the department. They should exhibit a willingness to do their best to advance the goals of the department by their willingness to teach those courses for which they were hired to teach, a willingness to develop new courses to support the department's curriculum, and are

expected to exhibit civility and professionalism when interacting with their colleagues. Faculty are expected to regularly attend department meetings, sharing in the department's decision-making process, and to participate in activities which contribute to the department's well being. At this point, leadership and service activity beyond the department is not considered essential.

Comprehensive Reappointment Review

The candidate's record in teaching, research, and leadership and service will each be evaluated separately as “not on track for tenure”, “not on track for tenure but could meet standards with appropriate corrections,” or “on track for tenure.” The candidate must demonstrate sufficient progress toward tenure to justify reappointment. The candidate’s record of teaching, research, and leadership and service are evaluated separately, indicating whether the candidate is “on track for tenure” in teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service; “not yet on track for tenure but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate corrections”; or, “not on track for tenure”.

The review may also take into account program requirements such as strategic goals of the department, college, and campus.

At this level, teaching and research should carry roughly equal weight. Although individual candidates may be stronger in one area than the other, the expectation is that performance and potential in each area should be relatively strong. Some development in the area of service beyond the department is also expected.

1) Teaching

The candidate will be expected to demonstrate effective teaching evaluated by multiple means. Examples of the means may be found described in the guidance given with the first renewal (reappointment). This evaluation includes contributions to the breadth, depth, and needs of the department and updating curriculum and course materials. In addition to classroom teaching, the candidate's work with students outside of the classroom as a mentor, research advisor, independent study director, intern supervisor and similar activities shall be considered here. In addition to the type of materials appropriate for the initial review, the teaching portfolio should include evidence of improvement (especially if weakness was noted in the first review) and innovation (e.g., the development of new courses or incorporating new techniques). In most cases the portfolio should include peer reviews of the candidate's in-the-classroom performance.

This review will be especially sensitive to the contribution the candidate makes to the department's curriculum and student rapport.

2) Scholarly Research and Creative Work

In addition to the type of materials appropriate for the first review, the research portfolio should include examples of published work, including refereed journal articles, well

placed book chapters, reports made to public or private agencies with a potential for affecting public policy, and other work which is appropriately screened for publication. However, in cases where the candidate considers a book to be the most appropriate form of scholarship for his or her research agenda, there may only be evidence that a well-developed manuscript is moving towards publication. Grant proposals, and especially grants awarded, may be another way of assessing progress on a research agenda. In all cases, there should be clear indications that future publications will be forthcoming. Generally speaking, candidates are expected to have produced the equivalent of about one refereed journal article per year (at this point, usually 4 or 5). Especially at this level of review, however, it must be remembered that it may take considerable time to get work into print. At this stage, therefore, potential for publication may still carry more weight than actual publications. Nevertheless, reappointment should not occur if the committee sees little or no realistic prospect that publications will be forthcoming within the next two years.

3) Leadership and Service

The department recognizes leadership and service to the campus, community and to our profession. In addition to continuing service, the candidate's record should show development in making extra-departmental contributions. These might include service on University and College committees, election to office in the Faculty Representative Assembly, participating in University activities, speaking to media or community groups or volunteer work in the community. In some cases, consulting work, whether compensated or not, may have a service component, if these activities enhance the reputation of the University or enrich the community.

Promotion to Associate Professor and/or Awarding of Tenure Review

The candidate's record in teaching, research, and leadership and service will be evaluated separately as “below expectations,” “meritorious,” or “excellent”. The candidate must be rated as, at least, “meritorious” in all three areas and must receive a rating of “excellent” in either teaching or research. Leadership and service is also required to be relatively strong, but only in very rare cases should it be the strongest of the three areas.

1) Teaching

The candidate will be expected to demonstrate effective teaching evaluated by multiple means which will include, at a minimum, Faculty Course Questionnaires and two other means of evaluation. Examples of other means of evaluation are provided in the appendix to this document. This evaluation includes contributions to the breadth, depth, and needs of the department and updating curriculum and course materials. In addition to classroom teaching, the candidate's work with students outside of the classroom as a mentor, research advisor, independent study director, intern supervisor and similar activities shall be considered here. To be successful, a candidate must have by now demonstrated instructional competence at a high level. The primary unit's assessment should be

especially sensitive to the student and peer evaluations in the teaching portfolio. In evaluating teaching, course content, course level, and class size will be considered in interpreting student evaluations.

2) Scholarly Research and Creative Work

The research portfolio is expected to demonstrate clear success in publication. While potential for future success is still a consideration, it no longer is a substitute for actual performance. Thus, the greatest weight will be placed on work in print, or forthcoming, in press. The general preference will be for refereed journal articles, well placed book chapters, monographs, and books published by well- respected academic or commercial presses, reports to public agencies that are acknowledged to have made important contributions to policy making, and other appropriately screened publications. Other types of published work (as detailed in the description of the portfolio at the previous level of review) may be considered. The general expectation about quantity is that the total be more than the equivalent of one refereed article per year of service (usually seven or eight). It is expected that these articles be published with some in first and second tier journals in our field. If the candidate has chosen book publishing as a major effort of their work, a book published or forthcoming in a fine academic or commercial press and one or two articles in first or second tier journals is expected. It is necessary, however, that the department exercise considerable discretion in judging the quality of the work and in determining whether a particular body of work meets this quantitative standard. In all cases, the quality of the work, and its placement in selective outlets, will be at least as important as the quantity, so that some candidates may be acceptable despite having "low" numbers, while other candidates fail despite meeting strictly numerical criteria. At least some of the external reviews must support the notion that the candidate has made a contribution to the discipline, although the nature of that contribution may be very different for different candidates. Presentations at professional meetings and non-refereed publications may be considered as secondary evidence of ongoing research activity.

3) Leadership and Service

At this point, the candidate should have a clear record of service both inside and outside the department, as indicated by the activities described at the previous level of review and those in the appendix to this document. The department recognizes leadership and service to the campus, community and to our profession. A rating of "meritorious" requires meeting leadership and service responsibilities within the department and leadership and service to the college, campus, community, or profession. A rating of "excellent" requires meeting leadership and service responsibilities within the department and multiple leadership and service contributions to the college, campus, community, or profession. In evaluating leadership and service both the quality and quantity of service contributions be considered.

Promotion to Full Professor Review

The candidate's record in teaching, research, and service will be evaluated as a whole as "below expectations," "meritorious," or "excellent." Promotion requires "a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent; a record of significant contribution to both graduate and undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances require a stronger emphasis or singular focus on one or the other; and a record, since receiving tenure and promotion to associate professor, that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching and working with students, research, scholarship or creative work, and service." At this level, consideration for promotion to Full Professor, different faculty will have found very different niches. Although all candidates are expected to make excellent contributions in teaching and research, any of the three areas may be more important in a particular candidate's career at this point than the other two. In general, the biggest contrast to the promotion to Associate Professor is that the leadership and service component should be more pronounced.

1) Teaching

The candidate will be expected to demonstrate effective teaching, evaluated by multiple means which will include, at a minimum, Faculty Course Questionnaires and two other means of evaluation. Examples of other means of evaluation are provided in the appendix to this document. This evaluation includes contributions to the breadth, depth, and needs of the department and updating curriculum and course materials. In addition to classroom teaching, the candidate's work with students outside of the classroom as a mentor, research advisor, independent-study director, intern supervisor and similar activities shall be considered here. In evaluating teaching, course content, course level, and class size will be considered in interpreting student evaluations. Substantial, significant and continued growth, development, and accomplishment as a teacher since tenure must be demonstrated through development of new and revised curriculum, new pedagogical techniques, participation in professional development, work with students outside the classroom, and other areas of teaching such as those in the appendix.

2) Scholarly Research and Creative Work

The department recognizes that scholarship can take many forms. Our department emphasizes fundamental discovery, scholarly work which integrates existing knowledge and applied research. We recognize scholarly study of teaching and learning issues in our field as a form of research. Substantial, significant and continued growth, development, and accomplishment as a researcher since tenure must be demonstrated through refereed publications, peer-reviewed grants, and other areas of research such as those in the appendix. While this may take many forms, it normally includes a continuing record of publication in outlets similar to those expected at the previous level. The level of productivity, though perhaps even more subject to the department's judgment than previously, should not show a serious decline. Other examples of appropriate activities include textbook authorship (if the text is well received intellectually), editing books (depending on the quality of the product), and serving as a journal editor. Outside reviews

at this point should indicate that the candidate's work is viewed as important and authoritative by others in his or her field. Exceptional quality of scholarly work may be considered to raise an evaluation in cases where the quantity is less. Presentations at professional meetings and non-refereed publications may be considered as secondary evidence of ongoing research activity.

3) Leadership and Service

The department recognizes leadership and service to the campus, community, and to our profession. In evaluating leadership and service both the quality and quantity of leadership and service contributions will be considered. Substantial, significant and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in leadership and service since tenure must be demonstrated through a discussion of leadership and service progress in the department, college, campus, university, community and in our profession. We recognize that different faculty at this level will fulfill this requirement very differently. Some leadership and service activities, such as acting in an administrative capacity within the University (e.g., serving as department chair) or engaging in extensive community activities may be much more appropriate now than at earlier levels. The appendix lists some issues that may be considered.

Post-Tenure Review

Recognizing the many different ways in which post-tenure faculty contribute to the University, we define "meeting expectations" for purposes of post-tenure review as consisting of three elements, each of which must be met: 1) having achieved a rating of "meets expectations" or higher on each of the annual merit reviews included in the time period under review, 2) having met the goals of the faculty member's current professional plan, and 3) having submitted an acceptable professional plan which indicates an ability to achieve "meeting expectations" or higher ratings in the future. If a faculty member is deficient in meeting this standard, the committee shall consider the total record of the faculty member during the review period to determine whether strengths in some time periods or some activities compensate for the deficiency such that a rating of "meeting expectations" is still appropriate. Ratings of "exceeding expectations" or "outstanding" will be awarded for exceeding these standards.

Faculty Responsibility Statement

The normal proportion of work effort in the Political Science Department is 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service. The activity must be consistent with the department and the Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure criteria in this section of the RPT document.

The normal teaching responsibility is to teach a 3/2 course load each academic year (three units per course or 15 credit hours total). Exceptions to this work effort may be made with the approval of the Department Chairperson and the Dean. All resident faculty will be made aware of these exceptions.

The normal agreement for new faculty (starting as assistant professors) will be 40/40/20. In their first year of teaching, they will be assigned a 2/2 course load but will be expected to teach a 3/2 work load thereafter. The focus of the first year should be minimal leadership and service and a strong start on teaching and research. They normally will develop a three-year alternating teaching schedule of courses that they were expected to teach when they were hired. In addition to these courses, new courses will be added of their preference and those that meet the department need. This schedule development usually takes about two and one-half years and then reduces new preparations in order for them to focus continually on the development of their research. It is expected that this plan of work will continue until at least the point of the person's comprehensive review for reappointment. The comprehensive reappointment review is only successful if the review indicates that the person will eventually be successful in the award of tenure. This statement of work responsibility must be agreed to by new candidates when they are hired.

Although this is the general plan for the new faculty, changes may be approved by the Chairperson with the concurrence of the Dean. Please see the appendix for a general explanation of the possible Faculty Responsibility Statement (FRS).

Appendix

Examples of Appropriate Criteria for Faculty Evaluation

A. Teaching

1. Student evaluation of teaching
2. Teaching awards and other outstanding accomplishments in instruction
3. Peer evaluation of teaching
4. Alumni evaluation
5. Quality of doctoral dissertation and master's thesis supervision and graduate committee contributions
6. Student advising
7. Innovations in teaching
8. Creativity in teaching
9. Participation in teaching-related subject activities
10. Effectiveness of students in succeeding courses and/or in the pursuit of graduate education and/or in careers
11. Student supervision in professional experience activities, internships, and/or independent studies
12. Evaluation of student performance in departmental examinations and assessments
13. Preparation of course material
14. Student development/encouragement (centers of excellence, library knowledge, learning disability, recognition, encouragement of students, etc.)
15. Course organization
16. New course development
17. Teaching improvement activity (workshops, conferences)
18. Role modeling and mentoring based on a teaching experience on any educational level.
19. Teaching contribution at any institution in addition to the University of Colorado
20. Risk factor involved in the teaching venture
21. Contributions of teaching to diversity
22. Advising and mentoring in job search, graduate school applications (letters of recommendation and proofreading resumes and cover letters)
23. Guest lectures and instructions to high school and middle school classrooms and teachers
24. Teaching, lectures, and instruction to community groups
25. Pedagogical development grants
26. Design of public outreach materials based on expertise
27. Publications on pedagogical methods
28. Engagement in public fora on pedagogy
29. Development of interdisciplinary programs or degrees
30. Authorship of textbook or other instructional materials
31. Evidence demonstrating use of publications for instruction outside our institution

B. Scholarly Research and Creative Work

1. Peer judged publications
2. Papers prepared for professional conferences
3. Recognition by other scholars of research and publications
4. Creative work
5. Performances
6. Readings
7. Unsponsored research
8. Grants and contracts (sponsored research)
9. Professional reputation (both inside and outside university)
10. Evidence of capacity for future achievements
11. Participation in development workshops
12. Participation in career development activity (workshops, conferences, summer schools, etc.)
13. Papers presented at professional workshops and conferences
14. Long-term research projects
15. Expert and technical consultation of research projects
16. Role modeling and mentoring of research on any educational level
17. Risk factor involved in the research venture
18. Cultural and societal impact
19. Contribution to diversity

C. Leadership and Service

1. Departmental, college, campus and university committees
2. Administrative service (such as program director, chair, center director)
3. Service to the profession and discipline (local, state, national, international level)
4. Consultation and public service
5. Role modeling and mentoring on any educational level
6. Reviewing research proposals
7. Reviewing books in scholarly journals
8. Reviewing grant proposals
9. Refereeing manuscripts
10. Participation at professional conferences, specifically organizational activities (organizational activities, local planning committees, site visit details, activities involved in local, regional and national meetings, etc.)
11. Membership in and/or office-holding in professional associations
12. Service contribution to education at any level and at any institution in addition to the University of Colorado
13. Contribution to diversity
14. Participation in faculty governance

This is a list of suggestions and is neither all-inclusive nor a list of requirements. Items are not ranked or grouped in any order of importance.

Further Information Regarding the Faculty Responsibility Statement

The Colorado Springs campus has approved the use of the Faculty Responsibility Statement (FRS) in faculty evaluation for tenure and promotion. If, for example, the primary unit decides to adopt a standard distribution of responsibilities for all faculty, that must be made clear. Likewise, if the primary unit adopts a standard distribution of responsibilities for pre-tenure faculty, but allows differential FRSs to be employed post-tenure, the allowable parameters of difference and the interaction between an individual faculty member's FRS and the criteria for promotion to full professor must be made as clear as possible. Finally, if a primary unit decides to allow faculty at all levels to operate under differential FRSs, the allowable distributions across the areas of review at each level of seniority and the interaction between the individual faculty member's FRS and the criteria for promotion and tenure must be made as clear as possible. The FRS must be implemented in such a way that the regental standard of "demonstrated excellence in either teaching, or research [scholarship] or creative work" is met.

For tenured faculty, the professional plan required for post-tenure review and the FRS (if required by the primary unit criteria) should be a single document that meets all the requirements of the primary unit criteria and the post-tenure review process. For all faculty to whom it applies, the FRS should be coordinated with any differentiated workload recognized in the annual merit evaluation process, but the distributions are not required to be identical. An FRS should be put in place for all faculty for whom it is required within 45 days of employment (or following tenure) and should be reviewed and potentially revised each year during the annual merit evaluation process, but may be revised at any time as needed. New (initial or revised) FRS documents must be approved by the department chair and dean, in addition to the agreement of the faculty member. Each college will develop processes for insuring that all FRS agreements required are in place and meet the requirements enumerated in this policy and the approved primary unit criteria that govern each FRS.

Those departments adopting professional practice as a category for evaluation must be especially clear about what activities fall under not only professional practice, but teaching, research/scholarship/creative work and service as well. Some activities previously considered under one of the existing categories may now be deemed more appropriate for consideration as professional practice. The regents' policy makes clear that all tenured faculty must have demonstrated significant accomplishments in both teaching and scholarship, and that excellence must be demonstrated in one or the other, but departments have discretion in defining the scope of each and in defining meritorious and excellent performance in each. Departments need to keep in mind that the evaluative weight and the actual workload associated with each category may differ, and that excellence is a function of quality as well as quantity.

College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences
Department of Political Science
RPT Criteria
Version History

Version 1: Initial Version

Approved by the Political Science tenured/tenure track faculty, 4/20/2020

Approved by Interim Dean Rex Welshon, 4/21/2020

Approved by Provost Tom Christensen, 6/19/2020

Effective Date, 7/1/2020

Version 2: Revised Version

Approved by the Political Science tenured/tenure track faculty, 3/20/2024

Approved by Interim Dean Constance Staley, 9/30/2024

Approved by Interim Provost Lynn Vidler, 10/4/2024