

College of Behavioral and Health Sciences
Department of Political Science & Public Management
Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Criteria
Effective August 1, 2023

It should be recognized that common sense and flexibility need to be used in the application of criteria. Faculty members truly outstanding in one area but less active or successful in others may well be contributing more to the well-being of the Department, College, or University than someone adequate in all areas but outstanding in none. With this in mind, this document provides minimum but not necessarily sufficient requirements in each area for the awarding of retention, tenure, or promotion. Successful faculty will meet these criteria in all areas and should exceed these criteria in one or more areas. See current policies: Policy on Academic Tenure ([1.025](#)), Faculty Appointments ([2.051](#)), and Policy on Academic Promotion ([2.063](#)) for additional information.

At any point along the path to tenure or promotion, reviewers (departmental and college committees, Chair, Dean, Provost, or President) are permitted to comment on job-related concerns, or a pattern of performance, not specifically enumerated in these criteria. Should such commentary be offered, these factors must be addressed by the candidate in all subsequent e-dossier submissions until such time as the concern has been alleviated to the satisfaction of the reviewers. Those job-related factors so identified in one review may play a significant role in future retention, tenure, or promotion decisions.

I. Faculty Retention, Years 1-3

A. Effectiveness in Academic Assignment

1. Teaching Effectiveness ([APSU Policy 1:025](#))

(a) Student evaluations shall be used as a formative, supportive tool rather than as a criterion for evaluating faculty. The Department expects each faculty member to be a reflective practitioner. Faculty will write a narrative analysis of student evaluations during the current dossier cycle. The narrative will describe opportunities for growth and future goals for Area 1. There is no required length for this narrative, but Faculty should respond to recurring student concerns.

(b) Chair/Peer review of instruction. (Policy 1:025) At least two peer reviews per year of teaching instruction from tenured faculty members are required of all faculty members undergoing personnel review during each review cycle leading to tenure. At a minimum, peer reviews should contain some narrative statements that comment on the teaching effectiveness of the candidate. Year 1-3 reviews should primarily be formative, providing suggestions for improvement to the candidate. Peer reviews for on campus courses, hybrid courses, and synchronous online courses may be conducted through videoconference. These are minimum standards, but not guarantees of meeting expectations.

Candidates should refer to current [University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion guidelines](#) for updates to university expectations in this area.

(c) If the candidate has taught any online asynchronous classes during the period under review, at least one peer review of teaching during that period should be a review of online asynchronous instruction. At minimum, peer reviews of online asynchronous instruction should contain some narrative statements that comment on the teaching effectiveness of the online learning environment created by the instructor.

(d) Candidates under review must show evidence of course and curricular development or improvements during the period under review.

(e) Office hours: each faculty member is expected to maintain appropriate office hours consistent with department guidelines either in person or by web conference.

(f) It is desirable, but not required, for candidates to engage in curricular and co-curricular activities that meet or exceed high impact practices as outlined in the University's Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) and Academic Master Plan. Engaging regularly in high-impact practices is grounds for exceeding expectations in this area.

(g) The faculty member under review must demonstrate evidence of regular collaboration with department members on academic issues as measured by regular attendance at department meetings and performance of reasonable assignments supporting the mission of the department.

(h) After their first year at APSU, faculty are expected to share the load of effective student advisement as measured by the percentage of majors advised each year to ensure that there is an equitable distribution of advisees for each of the permanent faculty members in the Department of Political Science & Public Management. The candidate should submit a narrative describing their advising activity and submit evidence of regular communication with advisees.

(i) Developing new programs or modifying new programs within the department or university to serve the needs of the community and region is highly desirable. Successful development of a new academic program is grounds for exceeding expectations in this area.

2. Non-Teaching Assignments ([APSU Policy 1:025](#))

(a) Evidence of administrative or supervisory duties as dean, department chair/director, program coordinator, or special activities for which reassigned time

is given, if applicable.

B. Research/Scholarship/Creative Activities ([APSU Policy 1:025](#))

1. During Years 1-3, faculty must publish one or more peer-reviewed publication by the third year seeking year 4, or have a letter of acceptance from the publisher. Evidence must be contained in the e-dossier. Please refer to Appendix A for a description of publications that meet this descriptor. (Required)
2. In addition, during the first three years, candidates must fulfill the requirements for any *one* of four options (A, B, C, or D) in the table under Appendix B. Evidence must be contained in the eDossier. (Required).
3. Publishing more than one peer-reviewed publication or fulfilling more than one of the options in the table under Appendix B during the period under review is grounds for exceeding expectations in this area.

C. Professional Contributions and Activities ([APSU Policy 1:025](#))

1. Service to Campus

During the period under review, the candidate must at minimum demonstrate evidence of ongoing participation in at least three of the options listed below, one of which **must be**

- (a) Committee work at the College or University level or other administrative service.
- (b) Service on Faculty Senate or special task forces.
- (c) Other participation or leadership in the university's governing and policy-making process.
- (d) Advisor to student organizations.
- (e) Other campus services.
- (f) Teaching, research, or instructional collaborations with other campus entities outside their own department

Participating in more than three of the options above during any review period exceeds expectations in this area. This includes participating in more than one instance of each. For example, if during a review period a candidate serves on the Faculty Senate (b), advises a student organization (c), and serves on two college committees (a), the candidate would exceed expectations in this area.

2. Service to the Discipline

During the period under review candidates are:

- (a) Required to maintain their membership in appropriate regional or national professional organizations.
- (b) Encouraged to serve as peer reviewer for academic publications.
- (c) Encouraged to participate in academic conferences as session chair, discussant, or panel organizer.
- (d) Encouraged to take on leadership roles in professional or academic organizations.
- (e) Encouraged to serve a committee member for dissertation or master's theses.
- (f) Encouraged to serve as editor or member of an editorial board of a journal within the discipline (or in a related discipline).
- (g) Encouraged to publish opinion-editorials in national newspapers or being interviewed by the national media on a discipline-related matter is also highly desirable.

Any three items from this list, not including item (a), during a single review period exceeds expectations in this area.

3. Service to the Department

During the period under review:

- (a) If solicited, all department faculty are required to participate in the writing of the five-year academic audit or program review self-study and attend the preparatory meetings for such if requested by the department chair.
- (b) In addition, candidates up for review must complete three of the options for departmental service outlined in Appendix D.
- (c) Completing more than three options from Appendix D or leading the self-study process during a review period exceeds departmental expectations for that period.

4. Service to the Community

- (a) Discipline-related presentations to a community group are desirable but not required.
- (b) Discipline-related advice and consultations to community groups are also desirable but not required.
- (c) Publishing an opinion editorial in a local or regional newspaper or being

interviewed by local and regional media is also desirable but not required.

- (d) Connecting students with employment opportunities or internship opportunities (consistent with APSU policy) is also desirable but not required.

5. Professional Development

This category includes training, workshops, seminars, continuing education, conference attendance, online training, or similar activities related to professional growth.

Any three items in the list above during a single review period exceeds expectations in this area.

II. Faculty Retention, Years 4-5

A. Effectiveness in Academic Assignment

1. Teaching Effectiveness ([APSU Policy 1:025](#))

(a) Student evaluations shall be used as a formative, supportive tool rather than as a criterion for evaluating faculty. The Department expects each faculty member to be a reflective practitioner. Faculty will write a narrative analysis of student evaluations during the current dossier cycle. The narrative will describe opportunities for growth and future goals for Area 1. There is no required length for this narrative, but Faculty should respond to recurring student concerns. In addition, during year 4 and year 5, candidates for retention should show evidence of having acted upon prior recommendations from the department RTP committee in this area (if any action was deemed necessary).

(b) Chair/Peer review of instruction. ([APSU Policy 1:025](#)) At least two peer reviews per year of teaching instruction from tenured faculty members are required of all faculty members undergoing personnel review during each review cycle leading to tenure. At a minimum, peer reviews should contain some narrative statements that comment on the teaching effectiveness of the candidate. Years 4 and 5 peer reviews of teaching can be formative or summative, commenting mainly on the teaching effectiveness of the candidate. These are minimum standards, but not guarantees of meeting expectations. Candidates should refer to current [University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion](#)

[guidelines](#) for updates to university expectations in this area. In addition, during years 4 and 5, candidates for retention should show evidence of having acted upon any advice received during prior formative peer evaluations or recommendations from the department RTP committee in this area

(c) If the candidate has taught any online asynchronous classes during the period under review, at least one peer review of teaching during that period should be a review of online asynchronous instruction. At minimum, peer reviews of online asynchronous instruction should contain some narrative statements that comment on the teaching effectiveness of the online learning environment created by the instructor. In addition, during years 4 and 5, candidates for retention should show evidence of having acted upon any advice received during prior formative peer evaluations or recommendations from the department RTP committee in this area

(d) Candidates under review must show evidence of continuing course and curricular development or improvements during years 4 and 5.

(e) Office hours – each faculty member is expected to maintain appropriate office hours consistent with college guidelines either in person or by web conference.

(f) It is desirable, but not required, for candidates to engage in curricular and co-curricular activities that meet or exceed high impact practices as outlined in the University's Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) and Academic Master Plan.

(g) The faculty member under review must demonstrate evidence of regular collaboration with department members on academic issues as measured by regular attendance at department meetings and performance of reasonable assignments supporting the mission of the department.

(h) After their first year at APSU, faculty are expected to share the load of effective student advisement as measured by the percentage of majors advised each year to ensure that there is an equitable distribution of advisees for each of

(i) The permanent faculty members in the Department of Political Science & Public Management. The candidate should submit a narrative describing their advising activity and submit evidence of regular communication with advisees.

(j) Developing new programs or modifying new programs within the department or university to serve the needs of the community and region is highly desirable. Successful development of a new academic program is grounds for exceeding expectations in this area.

2. Non-Teaching Assignments ([APSU Policy 1:025](#))

- (a) Evidence of administrative or supervisory duties as dean, department chair/director, program coordinator, or special activities for which reassigned time is given is desirable.

B. Research/Scholarship/Creative Activities ([APSU Policy 1:025](#))

1. Publications and Paper Presentations

- (a) During year 4 and year 5, candidates must have a second or more peer-reviewed publication of the type outlined in *Appendix A*.
- (b) Between the year 3 and year 5 review, candidates must fulfill the requirements for any *two* of four options (A, B, C, or D) in the table under Appendix B.
- (c) Publishing more than one additional peer-reviewed publication during the period under review, or publishing two peer-reviewed publication for a total of 2 publications **AND** fulfilling more than two of the options in the table under Appendix B exceeds expectations in this area.

C. Professional Contributions and Activities ([APSU Policy 1:025](#))

1. Service to Campus

During the period under review, the candidate should demonstrate evidence of ongoing participation in at least three of the options listed below, one of which must be (a).

- (a) Committee work at the College or University level or other administrative service.
- (b) Service on Faculty Senate or special task forces.
- (c) Other participation or leadership in the university's governing and policy-making process.
- (d) Advisor to student organizations.
- (e) Other campus services.
- (f) Teaching, research, or instructional collaborations with other campus entities outside their own department.

Participating in more than three of the options above during any review period exceeds expectations in this area. This includes participating in more than one instance of each. For example, if during a review period a candidate serves on the Faculty Senate (b), advises a student organization (c), and serves on two college committees (a), the

candidate would exceed expectations in this area.

2. Service to the Discipline

During the period under review candidates are:

- (a) Required to maintain their membership in appropriate regional or national professional organizations.
- (b) Encouraged to serve as peer reviewer for academic publications.
- (c) Encouraged to participate in academic conferences as session chair, discussant, or panel organizer.
- (d) Encouraged to take on leadership roles in professional or academic organizations.
- (e) Encouraged to serve a committee member for dissertation or master's theses.
- (f) Encouraged to serve as editor or member of an editorial board of a journal within the discipline (or in a related discipline).
- (g) Encouraged to publish opinion-editorials in national newspapers or being interviewed by the national media on a discipline-related matter is also highly desirable.

Any three items from this list during a single review period, not including item (a), exceeds expectations in this area.

3. Service to the Department

During the period under review:

- (a) If solicited, all department faculty are required to participate in the writing of the five-year academic audit or program review self-study and attend the preparatory meetings for such if requested by the department chair.
- (b) In addition, during the period under review, candidates up for review must complete three of the options for departmental service outlined in Appendix D.
- (c) Completing more than three options from Appendix D or leading the self-study process during a review period exceeds departmental expectations for that period.

4. Service to the Community

Two from any of the following four items are required by the end of the fifth year:

- (d) Discipline-related presentation(s) to a community group.

- (e) Discipline-related advice and consultations to a community group.
- (f) Other discipline-related service to the local community or larger society.
- (g) Connecting students with employment opportunities or internship opportunities (consistent with APSU policy) is also desirable but not required.

Any three of (a), (b), (c), and (d) in this area between the end of year 3 and the end of year 5 exceeds expectations in this area.

5. Professional Development

This category includes training, workshops, seminars, continuing education, conference attendance, online training, or similar activities related to professional growth.

III. Tenure (Year 6) and Promotion to Associate Professor

A. Effectiveness in Academic Assignment

1. Teaching Effectiveness ([APSU Policy 1:025](#))

(a) Faculty will write a narrative analysis of student evaluations during the current dossier cycle as well as a narrative supporting their growth in the area of teaching effectiveness. There is no required length for this narrative, but Faculty should respond to recurring student concerns. Successful candidates for tenure will demonstrate their commitment to reflecting, and when necessary, adjusting to student feedback and student needs. Successful candidates for tenure will show evidence of having successfully acted upon prior recommendations from the department RTP committee in this area (if any action was deemed necessary).

(b) Chair/Peer review of instruction. ([APSU Policy 1:025](#)) At least two peer reviews per year of teaching instruction from tenured faculty members are required of all faculty members undergoing personnel review during year 6. At a minimum, peer reviews should contain some narrative statements that comment on the teaching effectiveness of the candidate. Candidates should refer to current [University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion guidelines](#) for updates to university expectations in this area. Year 6 reviews should be summative, commenting on the teaching effectiveness of the candidate. In addition, candidates for tenure must show evidence of having acted upon any advice received during prior formative peer evaluations or recommendations from the department RTP committee in this area. If the candidate was unable or unwilling to act upon the advice of peers and/or the department RTP committee, a

narrative statement justifying the failure to act must accompany the tenure dossier.

(c) If the candidate has taught any online asynchronous classes during year 6, at least one peer review of teaching during that period should be a review of online asynchronous instruction. At minimum, peer reviews of online asynchronous instruction should contain some narrative statements that comment on the teaching effectiveness of the online learning environment created by the instructor. In addition, during year 6, candidates for retention should show evidence of having acted upon any advice received during prior formative peer evaluations or recommendations from the department RTP committee in this area. If the candidate was unable or unwilling to act upon the advice of peers and/or the department RTP committee, a narrative statement justifying the failure to act must accompany the tenure dossier.

(d) Candidates for tenure must show evidence of course and curricular development or improvements throughout their probationary period.

(e) Office hours – each faculty member is expected to maintain appropriate office hours consistent with college guidelines either in person or by web conference.

(f) Engaging in curricular and co-curricular activities that meet or exceed high impact practices as outlined in the University's Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) and Academic Master Plan is highly desirable for tenure candidates.

(g) The faculty member under review must demonstrate evidence of regular collaboration with department members on academic issues as measured by regular attendance at department meetings and performance of reasonable assignments supporting the mission of the department.

(h) After their first year at APSU, faculty are expected to share the load of effective student advisement as measured by the percentage of majors advised each year to ensure that there is an equitable distribution of advisees for each of the permanent faculty members in the Department of Political Science & Public Management. The candidate should submit a narrative describing their advising activity and submit evidence of regular communication with advisees.

(i) Developing new programs or modifying new programs within the department or university to serve the needs of the community and region is highly desirable.

2. Non-Teaching Assignments ([APSU Policy 1:025](#))

(a) Evidence of administrative or supervisory duties as dean, department chair/director, program coordinator, or special activities for which reassigned time is given is highly desirable for tenure candidates.

B. Research/Scholarship/Creative Activities ([APSU Policy 1:025](#))

1. Candidates must publish a third, or fourth peer-reviewed publication by the end of year 6, or have a letter of acceptance from the publication. Please refer to Appendix A for a description of publications that meet this descriptor. Minimum total of three (3) publications for Tenure.
2. Between the end of year 5 and the end of year 6, candidates must complete *one* of the options listed under Appendix B (A, B, C, or D).

C. Professional Contributions and Activities ([APSU Policy 1:025](#))

1. Service to Campus

During year 6, the candidate should demonstrate evidence of ongoing participation in at least three of the options listed below, one of which must be (a).

- (a) Committee work at the College or University level or other administrative service.
- (b) Service on Faculty Senate or special task forces.
- (c) Other participation or leadership in the university's governing and policy-making process.
- (d) Advisor to student organizations.
- (e) Other campus services.
- (f) Teaching, research, or instructional collaborations with other campus entities outside their own department

2. Service to the Discipline

1. During year 6, candidates under review are required to maintain their membership in appropriate regional or national professional organizations.
2. By the end of year 6, faculty must have accomplished at minimum three items from the following list. No more than two instances of each item may count in fulfillment of this requirement. (For example, serving on two dissertation committees and organizing one conference panel would meet minimum

expectations, but completing three peer reviews for a journal and nothing else would not)

- (a) Service as peer reviewer for an academic publication.
- (b) Participation in academic conferences as session chair, discussant, or panel organizer.
- (c) Taken on a leadership role in professional or academic organization.
- (d) Service as a committee member for dissertation or master's theses.
- (e) Service as editor or member of an editorial board of a journal within the discipline (or in a related discipline).
- (f) Publish an opinion-editorial in a national newspaper or been interviewed by the national media on a discipline-related matter.

3. Service to the Department

During year 6:

- (a) If solicited, all department faculty are required to participate in the writing of the five-year academic audit or program review self-study and attend the preparatory meetings for such if requested by the department chair.
- (b) In addition, during year 6, candidates up for review must complete three of the options for departmental service outlined in Appendix D.

4. Service to the Community

Three from any of the following four options are required by the end of the sixth year:

- Discipline-related presentation(s) to a community group.
- Discipline-related advice and consultations to a community group.
- Other discipline-related service to the local community or larger society.
- Connecting students with employment opportunities or internship opportunities (consistent with APSU policy).

Candidates will meet expectations if they accomplish any combination of three items from (a), (b), (c), and (d). Candidates may meet this requirement in any way they choose. For example, three discipline-related presentations to community groups would meet minimum requirements in this area.

5. Professional Development

This category includes training, workshops, seminars, continuing education, conference attendance, online training, or similar activities related to professional growth.

IV. Expectations for Tenured Faculty not being reviewed for Promotion

This section applies to all tenured faculty members, including Full Professors.

Like all full-time tenure-track faculty members, tenured faculty members are required to maintain the expectations for scholarly and creative work, administrative duties, teaching, advising, and service outlined in the Annual Evaluation Process the relative weight of which are established in consultation with the Chair of the Department.

Furthermore, it is understood that, within these areas of responsibility (teaching, scholarship, service, etc.) tenure grants the freedom to faculty members to engage in longer term projects, some of which are not capable of being captured in lists of annual criteria. However, such freedom comes with a commensurate responsibility to act in the interests of the health and well-being of the discipline, the university, the department, its programs, and its students.

V. Promotion to Full Professor

A. Effectiveness in Academic Assignment

1. Teaching Effectiveness ([APSU Policy 1:025](#))

(a) Faculty will write a narrative analysis of student evaluations during the current dossier cycle as well as a narrative supporting their growth in the area of teaching effectiveness. There is no required length for this narrative, but Faculty should respond to recurring student concerns. Successful candidates for Full Professor will demonstrate their commitment to reflecting, and when necessary, adjusting to student feedback and student needs. They will show evidence of having successfully acted upon prior recommendations from the department RTP committee in this area (if any action was deemed necessary).

(b) Chair/Peer review of instruction. ([APSU Policy 1:025](#)) At least two peer reviews per year of teaching instruction from tenured faculty members are required of all faculty members undergoing personnel review during each year since last promotion. At a minimum, peer reviews should contain some narrative statements that comment on the teaching effectiveness of the candidate.

Candidates should refer to current [University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion guidelines](#) for updates to university expectations in this area. Reviews from last promotion should be summative, commenting on the teaching effectiveness of the candidate. In addition, candidates for tenure must show evidence of having acted upon any advice received during prior formative peer evaluations or

recommendations from the department RTP committee in this area. If the candidate was unable or unwilling to act upon the advice of peers and/or the department RTP committee, a narrative statement justifying the failure to act must accompany the tenure dossier.

(c) If the candidate has taught any online asynchronous classes since last promotion, at least one peer review of teaching during that period should be a review of online asynchronous instruction. At minimum, peer reviews of online asynchronous instruction should contain some narrative statements that comment on the teaching effectiveness of the online learning environment created by the instructor. In addition, since last promotion, candidates for retention should show evidence of having acted upon any advice received during prior formative peer evaluations or recommendations from the department RTP committee in this area. If the candidate was unable or willing to act upon the advice of peers and/or the department RTP committee, a narrative statement justifying the failure to act must accompany the tenure dossier.

(d) Candidates for promotion must show evidence of course and curricular development or improvements throughout their probationary period.

(e) Office hours – each faculty member is expected to maintain appropriate office hours consistent with college guidelines either in person or by web conference.

(f) Engaging in curricular and co-curricular activities that meet or exceed high impact practices as outlined in the University's Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) and Academic Master Plan is highly desirable for tenure candidates.

(g) The faculty member under review must demonstrate evidence of regular collaboration with department members on academic issues as measured by regular attendance at department meetings and performance of reasonable assignments supporting the mission of the department.

(h) After their first year at APSU, faculty are expected to share the load of effective student advisement as measured by the percentage of majors advised each year to ensure that there is an equitable distribution of advisees for each of the permanent faculty members in the Department of Political Science & Public Management. The candidate should submit a narrative describing their advising activity and submit evidence of regular communication with advisees.

(i) Developing new programs or modifying new programs within the department or university to serve the needs of the community and region is highly desirable.

2. Non-Teaching Assignments ([APSU Policy 1:025](#))

(a) Evidence of administrative or supervisory duties as associate dean/dean, department chair/director, program coordinator, or special activities for which reassigned time is given is highly desirable for tenure candidates.

B. Research/Scholarship/Creative Activities ([APSU Policy 1:025](#))

1. Candidates must have published three additional peer-reviewed publication since last promotion, or have a letter of acceptance from the publication. Please refer to Appendix A for a description of publications that meet this descriptor. * Minimum total of three (3) additional publications for since Tenure.
2. Since tenure candidates must complete two of the options listed under Appendix B (A, B, C, or D).

C. Professional Contributions and Activities ([APSU Policy 1:025](#))

1. Service to Campus

Since tenure, the candidate should demonstrate evidence of ongoing participation in at least three of the options listed below, one of which must be (a).

- (a) Committee work at the College or University level or other administrative service.
- (b) Service on Faculty Senate or special task forces.
- (c) Other participation or leadership in the university's governing and policy-making process.
- (d) Advisor to student organizations.
- (e) Other campus services.
- (f) Teaching, research, or instructional collaborations with other campus entities outside their own department

2. Service to the Discipline

6. Since tenure, candidates under review are required to maintain their membership in appropriate regional or national professional organizations.
7. Since tenure, faculty must have accomplished at minimum three items from the following list. No more than two instances of each item may count in fulfillment of this requirement. (For example, serving on two dissertation

committees and organizing one conference panel would meet minimum expectations, but completing three peer reviews for a journal and nothing else would not)

- (a) Service as peer reviewer for an academic publication.
- (b) Participation in academic conferences as session chair, discussant, or panel organizer.
- (c) Taken on a leadership role in professional or academic organization.
- (d) Service as a committee member for dissertation or master's theses.
- (e) Service as editor or member of an editorial board of a journal within the discipline (or in a related discipline).
- (f) Publish an opinion-editorial in a national newspaper or been interviewed by the national media on a discipline-related matter.

8. Service to the Department

- (a) If solicited, all department faculty are required to participate in the writing of the five-year academic audit or program review self-study and attend the preparatory meetings for such if requested by the department chair.
- (b) In addition, during year 6, candidates up for review must complete three of the options for departmental service outlined in Appendix D.

9. Service to the Community

Three from any of the following four options are required by the end of the sixth year:

- Discipline-related presentation(s) to a community group.
- Discipline-related advice and consultations to a community group.
- Other discipline-related service to the local community or larger society.
- Connecting students with employment opportunities or internship opportunities (consistent with APSU policy).

Candidates will meet expectations if they accomplish any combination of three items from (a), (b), (c), and (d). Candidates may meet this requirement in any way they choose. For example, three discipline-related presentations to community groups would meet minimum requirements in this area.

10. Professional Development

This category includes training, workshops, seminars, continuing education, conference attendance, online training, or similar activities related to professional growth.

****Special Note:*** “At any point along the path to tenure or promotion, the department chair and department RTP committee are free to comment on job-related concerns, or a pattern of performance, not specifically enumerated in these guidelines. Should such commentary be offered, these factors must be addressed by the candidate in all subsequent dossier submissions until such time as the concern has been alleviated to the satisfaction of the department committee and/or the department chair. Those job-related factors so identified in one review may play a significant role in future retention, tenure, or promotion decisions.”

Appendix A: Standards for Peer-Reviewed Publications

A peer-reviewed publication as defined by this document will be an article in a refereed journal, a scholarly book, or a chapter in a scholarly edited volume that meets the following criteria:

1. The subject of the publication falls under the rubric of Political Science, Public Management, or a closely related field. Examples of closely related fields include but are not limited to: the scholarship of teaching and learning in Political Science or Public Management, political theory, public policy, public administration, political methodology, and interdisciplinary work at the crossroads of Political Science/Public Management and any other field of study. Evidence of articles accepted or “in press” shall be considered as having met the publishing criteria.
2. The publication demonstrates a contribution to the author’s academic area(s) of expertise that is original while at the same time building upon (as it acknowledges) previous academic work as contained in other scholarly books and academic journals. The publication must include a bibliography or list of references that clearly identifies previous academic work as contained in other scholarly books and academic journals *in addition to* any non- academic or non-scholarly sources consulted.
3. The main audience for the publication must be an academic audience defined as: other scholars and researchers, policy analysts, or undergraduate and graduate students in Political Science, Public Management, or a closely related field of study.
4. The text should be written in a manner consistent with the style, citation formats, terminology, and professionalism of other works in the field.
5. The publisher must be either a university press or a press known for high academic quality. Presses that are considered “vanity” and self-published works are not appropriate outlets for publication as constructed herein.
6. Co-authored articles are acceptable as long as the contributions of the candidate under review are made clear either in the article or in supporting documentation. Examples of acceptable documentation could include, but not be limited to: correspondence between the co-authors, section drafts written by the candidate, or a letter of attestation from the co- author(s).
7. Acceptable scholarship activities extend beyond the discipline to include the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL). SoTL publications, presentations or grant awards are of equal value to a discipline-specific activity.

Appendix B: Table for Research/Scholarship/Creative Activities

OPTIONS	REQUIREMENTS OF EACH OPTION
Option A	Two peer-reviewed papers presented at local, state, regional, national, or international scholarly meetings after beginning a tenure-track position at Austin Peay State University. None of the paper presentations listed under Option B can be claimed a second time for the purposes of fulfilling this requirement.
Option B	Attendance at two regional, national, or international scholarly meetings with undergraduate (or graduate) students at Austin Peay State University, having directed or contributed to research presented by these students.
Option C	Two non-peer-reviewed publications meeting the standards for such publications outlined in Appendix C.
Option D	Two or more additional peer-reviewed publication meeting the standards for such publications outlined in Appendix A.

Appendix C: Non-Peer Reviewed Scholarly and Creative Endeavors

Option	Requirements of Each Option
A	Publishing a non-peer reviewed article in a discipline-related publication. Example might include: an APSA sponsored blog, an invited policy-analysis for a think tank, a non-peer-reviewed chapter for a textbook or reader, or a non-peer-reviewed book review.
B	Giving an invited presentation on one's research to a practitioner-oriented organization, a student conference, non-profit, or other organization where one's expert work is not submitted to peers for comment and criticism.
C	Applying for grants for personal, departmental, or university funding to support research endeavors in political science.
D	Organizing and/or hosting a mini-conference, manuscript workshop, or other scholar-oriented event intended for the presentation and dissemination of original political science-related research.
E	Serving as a manuscript reviewer and writing a referee report for an academic journal or press (unpaid).

Appendix D: Departmental Service

Option	Requirements of Each Option
A	Participating as an internal or external reviewer on Program related Site Visits, such THEC Program Review.
B	Collecting student learning outcomes as requested by the General Education Committee or the Institutional Effectiveness Committee.
C	Attending two recruitment or orientation events organized by the department or university.
D	Serving as faculty advisor for a Political Science-related student organization.
E	Participating in recruiting efforts for the university outside the sponsorship of the department.
F	Giving a talk to a department sponsored event or an event sponsored by department-affiliated student organizations.
G	Applying for a grant related to promoting educational innovations, civic engagement, or professional development for political science students. Examples might include: a grant to fund a trip to a Model UN competition, a grant to fund a lunchtime student reading group, or a grant to fund attendance by political science students to a regional job fair.
H	Writing at least 3 letters of recommendation for students. Filling out a rating form does not count as a letter of recommendation for the purposes of RTP.
I	Actively cultivating internship opportunities for students in the department. Evidence provided inclusion of paperwork, visits with of office representatives; Legislative Internship program, etc..
J	Producing a peer-review of teaching for adjunct faculty or full-time faculty.

Academic Ranks – Instructor

Instructors are faculty members who have been appointed to tenure-track positions, but who have not yet attained the Ph.D. or its equivalent. Time spent in the rank of instructor does not count toward the probationary period to tenure. Like full-time faculty, instructors are expected to participate in all three areas of activity, teaching and advising, scholarship, and university service.

The following are criteria that distinguish between academic ranks.

Instructor:

- a. Demonstrated ability in instruction/student development.
- b. Master's degree from an accredited institution in the instructional discipline, or related area.
- c. Evidence of good character, mature attitude, and professional integrity.

Senior Instructor (5 years teaching experience):

- a. Documented evidence of high-quality teaching and contribution to student development.
- b. Master's degree from an accredited institution in the instructional discipline, or related area.
- c. Evidence of good character, mature attitude, and professional integrity.

Master Instructor (10 years teaching experience):

- a. Documented evidence of high-quality teaching and contribution to student development.
- b. Master's degree from an accredited institution in the instructional discipline or related area.
- c. Evidence of good character, mature attitude, and professional integrity – demonstrated excellence in teaching.
- d. Service to campus through Committee work and a Peer-reviewed paper presentation at a local, state, regional scholarly meeting or article publication in a referred journal.