

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE
BY-LAWS
REVISED SPRING 2021

	Pages
Meetings of the Department	2
Amending the By-Laws	2
Personnel Committee	
I. Personnel Committee functions	3
II. Members	3
III. Procedures	3
Faculty Evaluation Policies	
I. General	5
II. Evaluation of teaching	6
III. Evaluation of scholarship	8
IV. Evaluation of service	13
V. Notification and rolling averages	6
Promotion and Tenure Committee	
I. General	17
II. The Promotion and Tenure Committee	17
III. The promotion and tenure process	19
IV. Non-retention of probationary faculty	23
V. Requests for reconsideration	24
VI. Early tenure and promotion	24
Standards and Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor	
I. General	26
II. Teaching	26
III. Scholarship	26
IV. Service	30
Standards and Criteria for Promotion to the Rank of Professor	
I. General	31
II. Teaching	31
III. Scholarship	31
IV. Service	32
Faculty Recruitment	33
Appendix 1	A1
Appendix 2	A2

MEETINGS OF THE DEPARTMENT

- I. Faculty must be present at department meetings to exercise their rights of participation and voting. Faculty on leave of absence or sabbatical leave shall be entitled to full rights of participation and voting when they are in attendance at meetings.
- II. The quorum for department meetings is normally a majority of tenured and tenure-track faculty holding a half-time or greater teaching appointment in the department. Faculty on leave or sabbatical who do not attend are not counted in computing the quorum.
- III. Department meetings are scheduled by the Chair at a time when there are no conflicts with classes. The Chair may cancel meetings if there are no urgent items on the agenda.
- IV. Faculty members in residence are normally expected to attend department meetings. Those who cannot attend, due to professional obligations or personal circumstances, should notify the Chair of their expected absence.
- V. In certain circumstances, a vote may be conducted by the faculty via email. Faculty on leave of absence or sabbatical leave shall be entitled to full rights of participation and voting when a vote is conducted via email. A majority of those voting is needed to pass a measure.
- VI. At a faculty meeting during the spring semester, all tenured and tenure-track faculty who do not have full-time administrative appointments outside of the department will evaluate the Chair, according to the College Policies, Procedures, and Criteria Concerning Personnel Recommendations. For this evaluation, the meeting shall be chaired by the faculty member who is longest in rank. That faculty member shall draft the required narrative
and
submit it to the department for approval. The approval must be by a majority vote via email. If a majority cannot be secured for a narrative, separate narratives shall be submitted representing the respective irreconcilable evaluations

AMENDING THE BY-LAWS

These By-Laws may be amended when approved by a majority of the tenure-track faculty with the rank of assistant professor or above present at a formal department meeting.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

I. FUNCTIONS

- A. Members of the Personnel Committee are chosen on a rotating basis from members of the Tenure and Promotion Committee. They represent the faculty in making policy concerning faculty personnel issues including annual salary evaluations, sabbatical leaves, contracts (other than promotion and tenure decisions), retirements, resignations, and retraining.
- B. The Personnel Committee is responsible for conducting the annual merit review of all tenured and tenure-track faculty.

II. MEMBERS

- A. Three voting members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will serve on the Personnel Committee. The Chair will rotate membership on the committee and will try, when possible, to have several different subfields represented.
- B. Only in very rare occasions (e.g., a limited number of tenured faculty) will a faculty member serve on the Personnel Committee in back-to-back years.
- C. Members who resign or are no longer able to serve due to reasons of health will be replaced by another tenured member chosen by the Chair.

III. PROCEDURES

- A. The Chair of the department chairs the Personnel Committee.
- B. The Chair does not vote on personnel matters on which the Chair makes a separate recommendation to the Dean. On other matters, the Chair votes only to break ties. In the absence of the Chair, or in the event he or she recuses himself or herself from any decision, meetings shall be chaired and moderated by the Personnel Committee member who is longest in rank.
- C. The Chair, who has an independent recommendation on

personnel business, may or may not concur with the recommendation of a departmental committee. If the Personnel Committee makes a recommendation with which the Chair does not concur, the Chair shall forward to the Dean both his or her recommendation and the Committee's statement of its recommendation and advise the Committee of that action.

- D. All decisions are to be made by majority rule, that is, a majority of the voting members present. A quorum of two voting members, not including the Chair, is necessary for votes to take place in the Personnel Committee. All three members of the Personnel Committee and the Chair must be in attendance for the annual merit review meeting.

E. The members of the Personnel Committee are evaluated by that committee for annual salary considerations. Committee members will excuse themselves when their own work is being evaluated.

- F. Requests for reconsideration by departmental faculty, including the Personnel Committee members, on annual salary evaluations, sabbatical leave requests, and other personnel issues (except promotion and tenure) are made to the Personnel Committee. Requests for reconsideration should be submitted in writing to the department Chair within ten calendar days after the faculty member has been informed of the decision for which a reconsideration is requested. The Personnel Committee will act within ten calendar days of receipt of the written request.

FACULTY EVALUATION POLICIES

I. GENERAL

It is the responsibility of the department to evaluate its professional personnel on an annual basis. These evaluations are intended to serve two purposes. First, they provide a basis for recognizing and rewarding differential levels of overall professional performance. Second, they provide an important source of feedback for faculty and constructive information they can use to improve their contributions to the university and to the professional community. Faculty members shall be given copies of departmental, college, and university personnel guidelines.

The procedures described below have been designed to serve these purposes, and to honor (to the extent possible) three additional desirable characteristics. They are intended to be relatively simple to apply and to be sufficiently specific to provide prospective guidance to faculty. They are also intended to allow the responsible exercise of professional judgment by those conducting the evaluations.

Each spring, all members of the permanent faculty except those retiring or resigning at the end of the current academic year or on terminal contracts will complete a faculty service report describing their accomplishments and activities in teaching, scholarship, and service during the preceding twelve months (January 1 - December 31). They will also submit materials as described under parts II and III below and any supplementary material they consider relevant. The Chair will make guidelines for filling out service reports specific and comprehensive and will send them annually to the faculty.

The by-laws of the department, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, and the university are the operating documents for personnel evaluations. Prior to the merit deliberations each year, the Personnel Committee will be briefed systematically on these guidelines.

Annual evaluations of faculty members normally follow these weightings: teaching (40 percent), scholarship (40 percent), service (20 percent). In exceptional cases, a department member may petition the Personnel Committee to change the 40-40-20 formula for a given year. The faculty member must submit this petition at the beginning of the academic year. Twenty percent will be the minimum in any one category. A higher than 40 percent weighting in teaching requires

extra teaching assignments. A higher than 40 percent weighting in scholarship requires extraordinary research commitments. A higher than 20 percent weighting in service requires major administrative tasks. Under no circumstances will untenured professors be granted an exception from the 40-40-20 formula.

When a faculty member wishes to request a reconsideration of his or her annual merit rating, the Personnel Committee, meeting with the Chair present and the faculty member absent, will entertain the request.

II. EVALUATION OF TEACHING (normally 40 percent of evaluation)

In evaluating teaching, the Personnel Committee considers instruction inside and outside the classroom at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. The assessment of in-class instruction is based on student evaluation of teaching, course quality and appropriateness, and other considerations as specified below.

- A. Student Evaluation of Teaching. Outside proctors or designated students administer the teaching evaluations of all classes taught at the undergraduate and graduate levels, using the appropriate questionnaires and open-ended evaluation forms. The undergraduate and graduate questionnaires are adopted by a majority vote of the tenure-track faculty present at a formal departmental meeting. Each instructor also may add questions to the instrument used in his or her classes, but he or she does not participate in the administration of the evaluation. The department will give faculty members, for their own use, responses to individual questionnaire items in the form received from Testing Services. Junior faculty will be given copies of the open-ended responses, with the originals for all faculty kept on file and made available to the Promotion and Tenure Committee and Personnel Committee.

The Assistant to the Chair provides the Personnel Committee with summaries of the student responses to the undergraduate and graduate questionnaires, open-ended student responses, and the number of students enrolled in each class. Validated dimensions of teaching effectiveness are used to summarize the data generated by the undergraduate questionnaire for each class and other classes taught in recent years at the corresponding level (i.e. 100, 200, 300, 400). In the case of 500- and 600-level classes, the Personnel Committee considers

student responses to key items on the graduate questionnaire, comparing these to other classes at the same level. In addition, the Committee may consider other student assessments mandated by the department, college, or university. At the request of the instructor, it may also take into account student responses to individual items not included in the dimensions of teaching effectiveness or the questions added by the instructor. The Committee will be sensitive to the special circumstances of new or experimental classes in considering student evaluations.

Normally, a minimum of 10 students in undergraduate courses and 5 students in graduate courses shall have filled out the evaluations for the results to be used for salary increment purposes. If fewer responses are given, the findings will be used for feedback only, unless professors are teaching only one course. In this case, the evaluations will be used.

- B. Other Criteria for Evaluating In-Class Instruction. Since all aspects of teaching effectiveness are not necessarily reflected in student evaluations, faculty members will submit copies of syllabi, examinations, and other relevant materials for each course with their Faculty Service Reports. The Personnel Committee will use these materials in their assessments of course quality and appropriateness. It may take into account such factors as the types of exams and written assignments, the grade distribution within the course, new course designs or redesigns of existing courses ("before" and "after" syllabi must be provided), innovative teaching methods, class size in comparison to other courses at the same level (i.e. 100, 200, 300, 400, 500), rigor of required assignments, teaching awards, the completion of instructional projects funded by grants, and number of course preparations. Although important, these additional considerations cannot significantly compensate for poor classroom teaching.
- C. Out-Of-Class Instruction. With regard to undergraduate education, the Personnel Committee considers the supervision of honors theses, offering honors mini-sections, independent studies, participation in experiential learning opportunities (e.g., USOAR, URAP, Research Rookies), and mentoring. For graduate education, the Personnel Committee considers:

Supervision of dissertations
Supervision of M.A. theses or starred papers

Supervision of independent studies
Chairing advisory committees
Involvement in comprehensive examinations
Member of dissertation committees
Member of M.A. or Ph.D. advisory committees

- D. Overload Teaching. Additional credit for teaching is given to faculty members who (1) teach a voluntary or imposed overload that is certified by the Chair as being in the interest of the department, College, or Honors Program; (2) do not use this course to increase the weighting of teaching in their evaluation; and (3) do not request that it be counted under service.
- E. Evaluation Procedures. Contributions are normally expected to be made to both graduate and undergraduate teaching, although consideration will be given to potentially mitigating circumstances. When faculty members take a leave of absence or buy more than half-time from teaching, the Committee assigns a rating for the semester or semesters the faculty member is on leave based on the average ratings of the two previous years. Regular faculty who are not on leave will teach at least one formal course per year.

After reviewing all materials, each Personnel Committee member will submit a score from 1-5, with 5 being the highest or "best," in a non-secret manner. The faculty member's teaching rating will be the median score.

III. EVALUATION OF SCHOLARSHIP (normally 40 percent of evaluation)

The generation and sharing of scholarly knowledge is an essential component of the department's mission. All faculty are expected to be active scholars. In evaluating the scholarly contributions of colleagues, the Personnel Committee makes distinctions based upon its assessment of quality while recognizing the wide variety of appropriate outlets for disseminating knowledge.

The Personnel Committee evaluates only scholarly works published or grants awarded during the preceding year, unless faculty members choose to claim full credit for scholarly items presented in galley form. Scholarly works are grouped by the categories and subcategories listed below and awarded points. The scores within each category or subcategory may vary, depending on quality. In evaluating quality,

the Personnel Committee considers the prestige of the journal or publisher, quality of the refereeing process, acceptance rates, and length, as appropriate. Credit for co-authored items varies according to the faculty member's contribution.

R = range of points

D = default score

A. JOURNAL ARTICLES AND RESEARCH NOTES

1. Refereed article or article-length research note
(R = 7-21/ D = 14)
2. Other article or article-length research note (R = 4-10/ D =7)
3. Short research note; greater than 7 reserved for refereed work (R =4-10/ D = 7)

B. BOOKS AND MONOGRAPHS

Books and monographs will be evaluated on a 7-70 scale, according to the prestige of the press, the quality of the refereeing process, length, and any reviews that may be available. In evaluating books and monographs, the default score for refereed journal articles (or DRJA=14 points) will be used as a point of reference. In most cases, a short, refereed monograph should be roughly equivalent to a refereed journal article and, unless notably better or worse in quality, would receive about 14 points (1 DRJA). Scores greater than 28 (2 DRJA) should be reserved for book-length works. Books published by a reputable press should generally be worth at least 42 points (3 DRJAs) and those published by prestigious scholarly presses at least 56 points (4 DRJAs), up to a maximum of 70 points (5 DRJAs). Subsequent editions of books and manuscripts will be scored at .20 of original value or, upon request, substantive new material may be scored as one or more book chapters with credit up to .6 of original value.

C. BOOK CHAPTERS

Scores of greater than 10 reserved for refereed work or chapter published by prestigious press; greater than 14 reserved for refereed work comparable in quality to superior refereed article (R = 7-21/D = 10). Introductory or concluding chapters of a book edited by the author generally will be considered as part of criteria for the scoring of edited books. They will not be counted as separate book chapters. In certain circumstances (e.g., an introduction that is an original contribution), the author can petition the Personnel Committee to count the chapter separately.

D. EDITED BOOKS AND JOURNALS

1. Edited book of essays; greater than 10 reserved for externally refereed anthologies; greater than 14 for particularly prestigious presses (R = 7-21/ D = 10)
2. Edited special issue of journal; greater than 10 reserved for refereed journals; greater than 14 reserved for particularly prestigious journals (R = 7-21/ D = 10)

E. GRANTS

Receipt of externally funded grants administered through the Office of Sponsored Projects, for which the faculty member is listed as principal or co-principal investigator, or receipt of externally funded fellowship of more than one month's salary (R=2-14)

F. OTHER SCHOLARSHIP

1. Paper presented in a panel at a meeting of a relevant professional organization (political science, area studies, or related discipline) or a bonafide academic conference. (D=4). No more than 30 points may be acquired in a given three year merit cycle.
2. Book reviews or commentaries (D = 1)
3. Report prepared under contract (D = 2)
4. Reprint or subsequent edition of article, book chapter, edited book, or edited journal (D=2); upon request substantive new material may be scored higher up to .6 of original value.
5. Other (R = 1-2)

The Personnel Committee has the discretion to evaluate items that do not fit easily into the above categories, using the scores for DRJAs (14) and the default score for book chapters (10) as reference points. Long encyclopedia articles should be considered as book chapters and short ones as other scholarship (F 5).

To receive credit for scholarship, faculty members shall follow the steps listed below for each item. Credit for an item may be suspended for the year if the faculty member does not submit adequate information or materials to allow proper evaluation.

- * Give a complete bibliographic citation
- * Indicate whether the publication was refereed
- * Indicate in the margin the category and subcategory into which the item should fall (see categories above)

- * Provide a rationale for each item believed to be above the default score and include supportive evidence if appropriate (e.g., referee reports)
- * Include a copy of the work

In the days before the annual evaluation, the Chair will review the faculty members' categorization and at the annual meeting bring to the Personnel Committee's attention items that may more appropriately be listed in a different category or subcategory. If an item is reclassified, it will be scored in the point range of its new category.

During the evaluation, all voting shall be done in a nonsecret manner.

Items in Categories A-E will normally receive the default score. If, however, a faculty member provides a rationale for scoring an item above the default, the Personnel Committee will vote on whether to score it above the default. If a majority of those present votes yes, each committee member will score the item. Those who believe the item should receive a score higher than the default will vote that score. The median vote of all committee members will determine the score.

Even good scholarship may merit a score below the default if the indicators of quality are less persuasive than those for other works in the category. If a member of the Personnel Committee believes an item should be scored below the default, the Personnel Committee will vote on whether to score it below the default. If a majority of those present votes yes, each committee member will score the item. Those who believe the item should receive a score lower than the default will vote that score. The median vote of all committee members will determine the score.

The Personnel Committee may choose to use the procedures in the two preceding paragraphs to score items it has reclassified.

Items in Category F (Other Scholarship) will normally receive the default scores. Faculty may, however, receive less or no credit if there is evidence a conference paper, book review, commentary, contracted report, reprint, or translation has marginal scholarly value. Credit may also be reduced if there is evidence conference papers are repetitiously presented.

A faculty member may request reconsideration of item scores. To determine each faculty member's scholarship rating, the Chair will add the item scores from the present evaluation to the scores from

the two previous years. The Chair will then use the table below to convert the total points to a scholarship rating. If a faculty member earns more than 100 points, the extra points will be carried over to the next year. Carryover points redeemed in a given year ("X") will count towards the faculty member's total scholarship points in that year and in the two successive years ("X+1" and "X +2").

Conversion of Points to Scholarship Rating

Points	Rating	Points	Rating	Points	Ratings	Points	Ratings
0	1.00	25	2.00	50	3.00	75	4.00
1	1.04	26	2.04	51	3.04	76	4.04
2	1.08	27	2.08	52	3.08	77	4.08
3	1.12	28	2.12	53	3.12	78	4.12
4	1.16	29	2.16	54	3.16	79	4.16
5	1.20	30	2.20	55	3.20	80	4.20
6	1.24	31	2.24	56	3.24	81	4.24
7	1.28	32	2.28	57	3.28	82	4.28
8	1.32	33	2.32	58	3.32	83	4.32
9	1.36	34	2.36	59	3.36	84	4.36
10	1.40	35	2.40	60	3.40	85	4.40
11	1.44	36	2.44	61	3.44	86	4.44
12	1.48	37	2.48	62	3.48	87	4.48
13	1.52	38	2.52	63	3.52	88	4.52
14	1.56	39	2.56	64	3.56	89	4.56
15	1.60	40	2.60	65	3.60	90	4.60
16	1.64	41	2.64	66	3.64	91	4.64
17	1.68	42	2.68	67	3.68	92	4.68
18	1.72	43	2.72	68	3.72	93	4.72
19	1.76	44	2.76	69	3.76	94	4.76
20	1.80	45	2.80	70	3.80	95	4.80
21	1.84	46	2.84	71	3.84	96	4.84
22	1.88	47	2.88	72	3.88	97	4.88
23	1.92	48	2.92	73	3.92	98	4.92
24	1.96	49	2.96	74	3.96	99	4.96
						100	5.00

Unless he or she requests otherwise, the total points of a faculty member who has served as Director of Graduate Studies (DOGS) all or part of the three year evaluation period will be adjusted by an overload coefficient. This coefficient is equal to $1 + X/Y$, here X is the number of semesters in which the faculty member taught more than one, three credit-hour course meeting minimum enrollment criteria while holding the DOGS position, and Y is the number of semesters in the evaluation period (normally three years or six semesters). Teaching credited in this manner cannot also be credited under teaching or service.

Assistant professors in their first year at NIU will receive a 3.4 rating or a rating based on their scholarly work, whichever is better. The scholarship ratings for other first year faculty members will be determined by adding their scores and multiplying the total by 3. Assistant professors in their second year at NIU will receive a rating equivalent either to 20 points or points earned in their first year (whichever is greater) plus points earned in the second year, multiplied by 1.5. The ratings for other faculty members in their second year will be determined by adding their first and second year item scores and multiplying the total by 1.5.

When apprising individual faculty members of their annual evaluations, the Chair will report their respective item scores, total points, and carry-over points, if any. Each year the Chair will also prepare a list of all items in Categories A-E produced by faculty members, identifying the work (e.g., article in journal X, book published by press Y, grant from agency Z) and the respective score. Faculty members will not be identified by name. This list will be distributed to all members of the department and will be used as reference by future Personnel Committees.

IV. EVALUATION OF SERVICE (normally 20 percent of evaluation)

Service includes activities performed for the benefit of the department, college, university, profession, or public. In evaluating service, the department gives credit for effort and effectiveness, not place holding. Some positions typically require more effort, but faculty members may be more or less effective in carrying them out. Other positions may require substantial commitments of time in some years, and minimal effort in others. Some major and minor tasks may be carried out on an ad hoc basis.

Thus, the categories in the listing below are tentative. A position that typically entails "very major service" may, in a given year, merit less credit. An activity that is usually "major" may be upgraded or downgraded, depending on what was accomplished. A form of service that is typically "minor" may, under certain circumstances, receive greater consideration.

The weight accorded to service will be 20 percent for most faculty members. However, in order to fill the positions of Director of Graduate Studies and the Director of Undergraduate Studies, alternate weighting may be negotiated with the Chair, so long as minimum weights of 20 percent and maximum weights of 40 percent apply in teaching, research, and service. (Teaching will be weighted in proportion to the actual teaching load. For example, a person granted a one-course load reduction should weigh teaching performance no more than 30 percent.) Personnel Committee approval of the weights and compensation arrangements for these assignments is required. When evaluating the service of the the Director of Undergraduate Studies and Director of Graduate Studies, the Personnel Committee will take into account the Chair's written or verbal evaluations of the service performance of each person. The Personnel Committee shall be advised of any financial or non-financial incentives received by faculty holding administrative positions and may take this information into account in evaluating service.

In addition to serving on a departmental committee, all faculty members, regardless of rank, are expected to perform some important departmental service, such as those departmental maintenance activities listed in the FSR guidelines. If not assigned to a departmental committee in a given year, a faculty member should replace this activity with a second departmental maintenance activity. Faculty members should explain their departmental service on their faculty service reports. Only those who perform such service may receive better than a 3.0 service score based on additional departmental, university, or professional service. Departmental service shall be evaluated by the importance of the service and the time spent performing it.

Faculty members should include in their annual reports information about the nature of their service assignments (e.g., frequency of committee meetings, special assignments, and status as chair or member). Ordinarily, chairing a committee will receive a higher service evaluation than membership on the committee. Faculty members who teach a voluntary or imposed overload in the interest of the department, college, or honors program will have this assessed as teaching unless they specifically request in their annual reports

that it be counted as service. In the latter case, part A.4 below may apply.

Service is evaluated without regard to rank, except that probationary faculty are expected to provide only minimal service in their first years in the profession. Consequently, probationary faculty in a 6-year tenure track position will receive a median service rating the first three years in the profession at the rank of Assistant Professor. They should be given a higher rating if they nevertheless take on assignments in which they excel.

Peer evaluation of service will be guided by the following categories:

- A. Very major forms of service
 - 1. Serving as a major officer of a regional, national, or international professional association.
 - 2. Founding a professional organization.
 - 3. Editing or founding a journal.
 - 4. Teaching an overload for which there is no other weighting adjustment.
 - 5. Serving as Director of Graduate Studies or Director of Undergraduate Studies

- B. Major forms of service
 - 1. Serving on a major departmental committee.
 - 2. Serving as inter-departmental or departmental advisor.
 - 3. Serving on a major college or university committee.
 - 4. Serving as section head or equivalent at a regional, national, or international conference.
 - 5. Performing a major form of public service related to one's area of professional expertise.

- C. Minor forms of service
 - 1. Participating in departmental activities.
 - 2. Attending meetings of professional associations.
 - 3. Serving as a member of a departmental committee or a minor college, university, or professional association committee.
 - 4. Serving in a secondary administrative assignment.
 - 5. Serving as chair or discussant at meeting of a professional association.
 - 6. Reviewing manuscripts for journals, applications for grant agencies, or manuscripts for book publishers.
 - 7. Evaluating faculty members outside the university for tenure and/or promotion.
 - 8. Serving on boards or committees of professional societies.

9. Presenting guest lectures, public addresses, testimonies, or media appearances.
10. Organizing a panel at a major international, national, or regional conference.
11. External consulting or evaluation of departmental program at another university.
12. Serving on an editorial board.
13. Serving as faculty adviser to student organizations.

When faculty members take a leave of absence, the Committee assigns a service rating for the semester or semesters the faculty member is on leave based on the average ratings of the two previous years.

After reviewing all materials, each Personnel Committee member will submit a score from 1-5, with 5 being the highest or "best," in a non-secret manner. The faculty member's service rating will be the median score. Faculty service scores should be evaluated from a holistic standpoint. For example, a person who was quoted in ten different newspaper articles should not receive ten "minor" points for service. Instead, the Personnel Committee should examine how many of the above categories the faculty member participated and the depth of that participation.

V. NOTIFICATION AND ROLLING AVERAGES

After the evaluations are complete, the Chair will notify faculty members in writing of the following: (1) item scores for the scholarship rating (see part III above); (2) annual ratings on teaching, scholarship, and service; (3) the overall annual rating, weighted and combined; (4) the median and range of the overall annual ratings for the departmental faculty; and (5) a rolling average.

Each overall annual rating will be used in the process of calculating three successive merit increments. If a rating has been used fewer than three times and there is no merit increment for a given year, it will be saved to be used in a year when there is a merit increment. The rolling average will be sent to the college to be used for calculating merit increments. In determining the rolling average, the Chair averages the ratings of each year (calculated to two decimal places) that has not already been used to calculate three merit increments. Any rounding mandated by the College is done after the rolling average is completed.

The rolling averages of faculty members should be based on at least three years unless the faculty member has been at NIU fewer than

three years. More than three years will be averaged when ratings have been "saved" in the absence of merit increments in previous years. The initial ratings for entering faculty will be based on their first partial or first year in the department. Faculty who join the department for the Fall semester may choose to receive an overall median rating for their first year. They also may elect to drop this first-year median rating from their rolling average in subsequent years.

PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE

I. GENERAL

- A. These by-laws apply to all tenure and tenure-track Political Science faculty.
- B. All meetings regarding promotion and tenure are conducted in accordance with the latest available edition of "Roberts Rules of Order Revised," except when there is a conflict with the present by-laws.

II. THE PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE

A. Membership

1. All tenured associate professors and professors in Political Science who do not have a full-time administrative appointment outside of the department are voting members of the Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee, except as specified under Point 3 of this section.
2. All tenured professors in Political Science who do not have a full-time administrative appointment outside of the department are voting members of the Professors' Section of the P&T Committee, except as specified under Point 3 of this section.

At least three (3) tenured, full political science professors who do not have full-time administrative appointments outside of the department are needed to make a recommendation regarding promotion to full professor. If the department does not have three tenured, full political science professors who do not have full-time administrative appointments outside of the department at the time that a person either is nominated or nominates him/herself for consideration for promotion to full professor, then the following procedure will take place:

The one or two tenured, full political science professors who do not have full-time administrative positions outside of the department will choose either one or two people (depending on how many slots need to be filled to get three people on the committee) from the following categories:

- a. tenured, full professors in the department who have full-time administrative appointments outside of the department, but who have had voting rights in department in the past three(3)academic years.
- b. tenured, full professors from the Department of Public Administration
- c. political science emeritus professors from the department who have been retired for three (3) years or less.

If there are no tenured, full political science professors who do not have full-time administrative positions outside of the department, then the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, in consultation with the chair, will create a committee comprised of people in categories a, b, and c.

All committees must be approved by the chair unless there are no tenured, full political science professors who do not have full-time administrative positions outside of the department. In that case, refer to the preceding paragraph. If the chair is a candidate for promotion to full professor, then the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences must approve the committee.

In all cases where additional people are needed to serve on the full professor committee, at the beginning of the process the candidate for full professor will be able to provide input on specific people from categories a, b, and c who she/he would like to serve. Such suggestions are non-binding.

3. The department Chair is an ex-officio, nonvoting member of the Committee, as well as the Section if he or she holds the rank of professor.

B. Procedures

1. Meetings of the Committee and the Section are scheduled by the department Chair with ample notice at a reasonable time when there are no conflicts with classes taught by eligible faculty.
2. A majority of voting members constitutes a quorum for meetings of the Committee and the Section. Faculty on leave or sabbatical who do not attend are not counted in computing the quorum.

3. The Committee and the Section each elects a Chair, who presides over their respective meetings. These faculty chairs are voting members.
4. Procedural decisions of the Committee and the Section require a majority of the voting members who are present and voting. Substantive decisions require a majority of the members who are present.

III. THE PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCESS

A. Annual Evaluations

1. The P&T Committee reviews the progress of probationary faculty each year. Special attention is devoted to three-year reviews. The department Chair communicates in writing the findings of the annual and three year reviews to the faculty member within ten days of their completion. At least three days prior to the date of their communication to the faculty member, these findings will be circulated among members of the Committee who attended the meeting.
2. Probationary faculty in their third year receive a more detailed progress report. The Chair will convene a committee of three people (at least one of whom will come from the third year, probationary faculty member's subfield, if possible) who will read all of the faculty member's work and provide a detailed report to the P&T Committee regarding both the quality and the quantity of the work as well as any glaring weaknesses in the faculty members' record.
3. The Professors' Section reviews the progress of associate professors toward promotion when requested by the faculty member or the department Chair. The faculty and Chair together communicate in writing the findings of the review to the faculty member within ten days of its completion. At least three days prior to the date of their communication to the faculty member, these findings will be circulated among members of the Section who attended the meeting.

B. Nominations

1. Persons in the next to the last year of their probationary period are automatically nominated for tenure and, in the

case of assistant professors, for promotion to the rank of associate professor.

2. Any tenured faculty member may nominate a colleague in political Science for early tenure and promotion to associate professor with his or her consent.
3. Any tenured professor may nominate a colleague in Political Science for promotion to the rank of professor with his or her consent. Self-nomination is also appropriate.
4. Nominations must be made in writing and directed to the department Chair no later than March 1 of the calendar year prior to the calendar year during which promotion and/or tenure would become effective if approved by the university.

C. External Reviews

1. P&T recommendations from Political Science are accompanied by at least four letters of external evaluation. All review letters received will be included in the candidate's file.
2. During the Spring semester, the P&T Committee or Professors' Section meets to decide whether to solicit external reviews for candidates who have been nominated. A positive decision requires a majority of those present at the time of the vote. A vote shall not be taken in the absence of a quorum.
3. If the Committee or Section decides not to solicit external reviews, the faculty member may request reconsideration.
4. If external reviews are to be solicited, each candidate provides the respective faculty Chair and the department Chair with the names and addresses of at least four individuals in his or her field who are qualified to evaluate their published research. The candidate also may provide the names of potential reviewers he or she prefers not be contacted, with reasons for the exclusions.
5. The Committee or Section compiles its own list of at least four outside reviewers. In the case of joint appointments, names shall also be solicited from the other unit.
6. From the lists, the Committee or Section develops an ordered list of reviewers. None of the lists shall include graduate school colleagues, former professors, or individuals with whom the candidate has a close personal relationship.

7. Upon the advice of the relevant personnel committee, the department Chair (or in the case of candidates being considered for full professor, the Faculty Chair of the full professor's section) contacts persons from the ordered list to solicit their cooperation in providing confidential letters of evaluation. At least one of the letters obtained shall be from a person on the candidate's list, provided he or she complies with the above criteria.
8. Individuals who agree to serve as reviewers are asked in a cover letter from the department Chair (or in the case of candidates being considered for full professor, the Faculty Chair of the full professor's section) to follow the enclosed guidelines in assessing the faculty member's performance and promise, as reflected in his or her work. The letter is accompanied by (a) a statement of the relevant Political Science, college, and university criteria for promotion and Part I of the promotion and tenure form prepared for the college; (b) copies of the candidate's curriculum vita; and (c) recent publications, as selected by the Committee or Section with the input of the candidate. Reviewers are informed that a summary of their evaluation may be provided to the candidate, upon his or her request, and that their confidentiality is protected.

D. Determination of Faculty Recommendations

1. The file of each candidate for promotion and tenure will be available in the department office in the Fall Semester at a reasonable time prior to the meeting at which the faculty recommendation is determined. All faculty eligible to vote on the faculty recommendation to the college (see Point 3 in this Section) are expected to carefully review the respective file.
2. Early in the Fall semester, the P&T Committee meets to evaluate the record and external reviews of candidates for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor. The Professors' Section does the same for candidates for promotion to the rank of professor.
3. Recommendations of the Political Science faculty to the college are determined by:

- (a) all tenured faculty who do not have full-time administrative appointments outside of the department in the case of decisions concerning tenure;
 - (b) all faculty at the rank of associate professor and above who do not have full-time administrative appointments outside of the department in the case of decisions concerning promotion to the rank of associate professor; and
 - (c) all faculty at the rank of professor who do not have full-time administrative appointments outside of the department in the case of decisions concerning promotion to the rank of professor.
4. Meetings of faculty eligible to vote on promotion and tenure are convened by the department Chair with ample notice at a reasonable time when there are no conflicts with classes taught by eligible faculty. They may be scheduled in conjunction with meetings of the P&T Committee or the Professors' Section, as appropriate.
 5. The Chair of the P&T Committee presides over meetings to determine faculty recommendations regarding tenure or promotion to associate professor. The Chair of the Professors' Section presides over meetings to determine faculty recommendations regarding promotion to professor.
 6. The quorum for these meetings is three-fifths (60 percent) of those eligible to attend. Faculty on leave or sabbatical who do not attend are not counted in computing the quorum.
 7. After the record of each candidate is discussed, a vote is taken in a non-secret manner. A positive recommendation requires a majority of those present at the time of the vote. A vote shall not be taken in the absence of a quorum.

E. Faculty Recommendations

1. The respective faculty Chair prepares the relevant papers for submission to the College Council, unless he or she has voted in the minority. In the latter case, the faculty who voted in the majority select one of their number to prepare the papers. The person who prepares the papers may be assisted by an ad hoc committee elected by the faculty who were present to vote on the recommendation.

2. An initial draft of the faculty recommendation is distributed for their suggestions to all faculty who were in attendance at the meeting when the vote was taken. These suggestions are considered for incorporation into a second draft of the letter, which is subsequently distributed and voted upon by non-secret e-mail ballot by the same faculty.
3. The second draft is approved if a majority of the e-mail ballots sent out are returned with a positive vote.
4. If the second draft is not approved by e-mail ballot, then one or more additional meetings of the eligible faculty (see Part III, Section D, Point 3) are held to reach agreement on the letter. The quorum for any additional meetings is a majority of those in attendance at the first meeting when the vote was taken. Only those faculty who were present to vote on the recommendation may vote on the letter. The letter is approved by a majority of those present and voting.
5. If a candidate appeals to the college or from there to a higher level of the university and letters from the Political Science faculty are requested, the persons who were present to vote on the faculty recommendation meet to deliberate on a response. These faculty approve the letter by a simple majority vote at the meeting or by e-mail ballot. Alternatively, they may delegate the drafting of the letter to an ad hoc committee.

F. Recommendations by the Department Chair

1. After the relevant faculty reach a decision on whether to recommend a candidate to the college, the department Chair shall inform the candidate of both the faculty recommendation and his or her separate recommendation within five calendar days.
2. The recommendation of the department Chair is conveyed to the college in a separate letter.
3. A faculty member may request the Chair to reconsider a negative recommendation regarding his or her case.

G. Review of Associate Professors

In compliance with policy adopted by the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS), the Department will provide written feedback to all associate professors on progress toward promotion to the rank of full professor at three year intervals. Any faculty member who wishes to not receive feedback can opt out by requesting in writing that they do not want their record to be reviewed. Faculty members who are eligible for a review, but have opted out, will be asked on an annual basis if they wish to be reviewed. Each time a faculty member opts out, or chooses to not be reviewed, they must do so in writing. The purpose of the review is to provide guidance and feedback on the strengths and weaknesses of an associate professor's progress toward promotion to full professor pursuant to the department's promotion standards and practices. The process of seeking promotion to full is not altered by this mentorship review policy and associate professors should consult the relevant by-laws on promotion to full to learn the Department's requirements.

The review will be conducted by all full professors in the Department and the person being reviewed will be responsible for providing the necessary information to conduct the review (i.e. curriculum vitae, evidence of impact of research, evidence of national reputation, etc.). The Department Chair will provide a written summary of the review. When the expertise or research focus of the full professors in the Department is not sufficient to make a fully informed assessment, and when there are fewer than three full professors in the Department, the Department will seek comment from persons outside the department with the requisite expertise to make a more fully-informed assessment of a particular associate professor's progress toward promotion to full professor. For the purpose of the review the full professors will meet in March of each year and the feedback will be provided to the associate professor and CLAS by May 15 of that same year, unless CLAS should change the policy and insist on a different date. Once a faculty member receives written feedback, the Department is not required to provide feedback again until another three years has passed.

IV. NON-RETENTION OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY

1. The department may recommend before the end of the probationary period that a non-tenured faculty member not be retained.

2. A recommendation to the college regarding non-retention is determined by all tenured faculty in the department who do not have full time administrative appointments outside of the department.
3. A meeting to make a recommendation regarding non-retention is convened by the department Chair with ample notice at a reasonable time when there are no conflicts with classes taught by eligible faculty. The department Chair presides.
4. The quorum for this meeting is three-fifths (60 percent) of those eligible to attend. Faculty on leave or sabbatical who do not attend are not counted in computing the quorum.
5. After the record of the non-tenured faculty member is discussed, a vote is taken in a non-secret manner. A recommendation to terminate employment before the end of the probationary period requires a majority of those present at the time of the vote. A vote shall not be taken in the absence of a quorum.
6. The department Chair submits a separate recommendation to the college.

V. REQUESTS FOR RECONSIDERATION

1. A faculty member who is negatively affected by a decision during the P&T process or by a non-retention recommendation may request that the respective personnel committee, group of faculty, or administrator reconsider his or her case. The faculty member shall have the opportunity to make a statement at this meeting.
2. Requests for reconsideration must be submitted in writing to the Chair of the personnel committee, the presiding officer of the meeting at which a negative faculty recommendation was adopted, the department Chair, as appropriate, no later than ten days after the faculty member is informed in writing of the decision.
3. Requests for reconsideration of faculty decisions are decided in meetings of the relevant personnel committee or group of faculty, following the procedures used in the initial meeting. All eligible faculty are expected to attend; those

who were absent from the initial meeting are eligible to vote.

4. If a request for reconsideration is successful, the relevant promotion or promotion and tenure letters will be (re)written and approved, following the procedures in Part III, Section E, prior to submission to the college.

VI. EARLY TENURE AND PROMOTION

- A. Early tenure is supported only when candidates have produced scholarly research of outstanding quality and have clearly exceeded the department's usual qualitative and quantitative expectations in the area of scholarly research. Candidates must also show evidence they have met in an effective way the standards of the department, college, and university in teaching and service. The burden of proof of extraordinary circumstances or an extraordinary level of achievement rests with the department. A recommendation for tenure shall be judged early only if it occurs prior to the year stipulated in the letter of appointment as the year in which the tenure recommendation was normally to have been made.
- B. Early promotion is supported only when candidates have produced scholarly research of outstanding quality and have clearly exceeded the department's usual qualitative and quantitative expectations in the area of scholarly research. Candidates must also show evidence they have met in an effective way the standards of the department, college, and university in teaching and service. The burden of proof of extraordinary circumstances or an extraordinary record of achievement rests with the department. A recommendation for promotion to the rank of associate professor shall be judged early only if it occurs prior to the year stipulated in the letter of appointment as the year in which the tenure/promotion recommendation was normally to have been made.

STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION
TO THE RANK OF ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

I. GENERAL

The department adheres to the criteria appearing in the Policies, Procedures, and Criteria Concerning Personnel Recommendations of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, the Working Rules of the University Council Personnel Committee, and the Constitution and By-Laws of Northern Illinois University.

The department endorses and applies the college mandate that it recruit and maintain the best faculty possible within its means. In applying those standards, the department affirms that tenure is not a right and expects that candidates for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor will have a demonstrated record which promises continued excellence of performance in either teaching or scholarship, and a demonstrated record of continuing performance at a high level in the other.

II. TEACHING

A record of effective teaching is expected for tenure and promotion. Evidence of effective teaching includes (1) positive student evaluations based on departmental instruments; (2) positive yearly teaching evaluations by the Personnel Committee; (3) the rigor of course requirements, including written assignments where appropriate; (4) contributions to the professional development of graduate and undergraduate students; and (5) efforts to improve teaching.

III. SCHOLARSHIP

Tenure and promotion guidelines are intended to provide faculty with a better understanding of the level of achievement the department values. A holistic approach will be employed to judge each individual applicant's achievements in research, teaching, and service.

The department requires a record of scholarship that includes publication in recognized scholarly outlets and that shows evidence that the candidate is in the process of establishing a national reputation among fellow experts through a sustained commitment to high quality scholarship. The department also expects that the scholarly record of a candidate for promotion and tenure shall be evaluated positively by external reviewers.

Faculty will be evaluated based on the quality, quantity, and impact of their research as well as their potential for productivity in the future. With respect to quantity, a successful candidate is generally expected to publish between 7-10 peer reviewed articles, book chapters, law reviews, or edited books. Additionally, the candidate must have a record, and a research agenda, promising strong future scholarly productivity. With respect to publications prior to the faculty member's appointment, the Tenure and Promotion Committee will determine which, if any, of these publications will count toward tenure requirements at the time of the hire.

With respect to quality, generally a successful candidate will publish at least four (4) articles in journals listed in Appendix 1. An article published in a journal listed in Appendix 2 will be given greater weight than other journals, usually the equivalent of two (2) articles. Journals are included on this table based on impact, rejection rates, and readership among political scientists.¹ Refereed books will generally be the equivalent of 3-4 articles published in journals listed in Appendix 1. The weighting depends on the reputation of the publisher within the subfield and the impact, defined below, of the work. Additionally, it is expected that faculty will publish at least one single-authored peer reviewed article, book, or book chapter.

The journals listed in Appendices 1 and 2 will be reviewed each year by the Tenure and Promotion Committee. Faculty may petition to have a journal added to the tables by providing quantitative measures (e.g., acceptance rates, impact scores) of the journal. A majority of the Tenure and Promotion Committee must vote in favor of a journal to be removed or added.

Impact of the faculty member's published work will be determined by such measures as citation counts, assignment in graduate seminars, reprints, downloads, and invited talks. The evaluations of the external reviews will be of particular importance when determining impact.

¹ The journals listed on the tables are compiled from the following sources: Giles, Michael W., and James C. Garand, "Ranking Political Science Journals: Reputational and Citational Approaches." *PS* (2007): 741-751, Table 4; Garand, James C., Michael W. Giles, Andre Blais, and Iain McLean, "Political Science Journals in Comparative Perspective: Evaluating Scholarly Journals in the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom." *PS* (2009): 695-717, Tables 2 and 4; Moore, Michael J., "Political Theory Today: Results of a National Survey." *PS* (2010): 265-272, top ranked journals on Table 6. Asian Studies journals were added based on acceptance rates and impact.

In line with College policies, any candidate whose tenure-track appointment begins after 1998 is expected to have submitted one or more proposals to granting agencies for external funding of the candidate's scholarly program. The process for securing external reviews is outlined in the Promotion and Tenure Process section of these By-Laws.

IV. SERVICE

A record of activity in support of the programs of the department, college, or university is normally expected for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor. In addition, the candidate is encouraged to show evidence of service to professional associations.

STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION
TO THE RANK OF PROFESSOR

I. GENERAL

The department adheres to the criteria appearing in the Policies, Procedures, and Criteria Concerning Personnel Recommendations of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, the Working Rules of the University Council Personnel Committee, and the Constitution and By-Laws of Northern Illinois University.

Promotion to the rank of professor recognizes the achievement of excellence in scholarly life and is accorded only to those with an established national reputation as scholars. Excellence in scholarly life is achieved through compilation of a distinguished record in teaching as well as scholarship and in continuing service to the department, university, and profession. Although candidates for promotion cannot be expected to achieve equally high distinction in every professional aspect, they must present persuasive evidence of excellence in teaching and scholarship. Particular attention will be paid to the quality of teaching and published research since appointment to the rank of associate professor.

II. TEACHING

A record of sustained excellence in teaching inside and outside the classroom is required for promotion. To assess teaching at the graduate level, the department will consider various factors including student evaluations, service on M.A. and Ph.D. committees, recruitment and placement of graduate students, direction of graduate research, and participation in curriculum development. To assess teaching at the undergraduate level, the department will consider various factors including student evaluations, direction of undergraduate research, curriculum development, and documented advising or mentoring. Contributions to both graduate and undergraduate education are normally expected.

III. SCHOLARSHIP

For promotion to the rank of professor, the department requires a record of scholarship that includes publications in a variety of scholarly outlets and evidence that such publications have produced a national reputation for high quality scholarship. In line with College policies, any candidate recommended for promotion to the rank

of professor during and after Fall 2000 is expected to have submitted one or more proposals to granting agencies for external funding of the candidate's scholarly program. Upon request, the department will provide candidates with copies of relevant college and university standards regarding promotion to the rank of professor.

The department expects that the scholarly record of a candidate to the rank of professor shall be evaluated positively by external reviewers. The process for securing external reviews is outlined in the Promotion and Tenure Process section of these By-Laws.

IV. SERVICE

A record of active professional and institutional service is normally expected for promotion to the rank of professor. The record of service should include evidence of participation in professional meetings or service in professional associations. The record of institutional service should include evidence of advancing the condition and activities of the university through participation on committees at the department, college, or university level.

FACULTY RECRUITMENT AND HIRING

1. Departmental recruiting is the responsibility of the Chair with input from all tenured and tenure-track faculty in the department. Each spring, the Chair will present the department with a hiring plan that the department will present to the Dean for the following academic year. The hiring plan must be approved by a majority of the tenured and tenure-track faculty who do not have full-time administrative positions outside of the department. If the department does not approve the hiring plan, a tenured or tenure-track faculty member may present an alternative plan for consideration. Recruitment will take into account the teaching requirements of the department at both the graduate and undergraduate levels as well as the department's research needs.
2. For tenure-track searches, the Chair will appoint a search committee comprised of a chair and three other faculty members to screen the candidates and create short lists. The search committee must be approved by a majority of tenured and tenure track faculty who do not have a full-time administrative appointment outside of the department. The search committee will make recommendations on interviewing to the Dean. The Chair may concur or make an independent recommendation. The chair of the search committee is responsible for putting together the Part I document.
3. Tenure-track positions in the department will be nationally advertised on APSA's e-jobs and other appropriate publications.
4. Candidates for tenure-track positions will give a presentation before the faculty of the department and meet with the Search Committee. Evaluations of the candidates will be solicited by the Search Committee from all faculty members.
5. Tenured and tenure-track faculty who do not have full-time administrative appointments outside of the department will vote on the acceptability of the interviewed candidates and provide a ranking to the Dean for hiring preferences. The Chair may concur with this decision or offer his/her own assessment.
6. The Promotion and Tenure Committee must approve recommendations to hire at the level of associate or full professor in accordance with College by-laws.

7. The department will negotiate tenure-track joint appointments with other units of the university only if they follow the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences' "Policy Regarding Joint Center-Departmental Tenure Track Appointments" and if provisions 7a through 7e of this paragraph are followed:
 - 7a. Joint appointment positions will be nationally advertised in the APSA Personnel Newsletter or other appropriate publications.
 - 7b. Points 4, 5, and 6 above apply to joint appointments.
 - 7c. Acceptance by the Chair and tenured and tenure track faculty who do not have a full-time administrative position outside of the department membership of a joint appointment initiated by another unit is contingent upon satisfactory written assurances from the Dean and/or Provost that the hire will not be assumed to meet other departmental personnel priorities nor adversely affect faculty recruitment for these priorities. The negotiations with the department will consider the department's own assessment of its program direction, hiring needs and priorities.
 - 7d. Terms of employment will be described in a memorandum of understanding among the department, the cooperating unit, and the incoming faculty member, consistent with College and departmental policies. The Chair and tenured and tenure track faculty must agree to this memorandum of understanding.
 - 7e. Faculty on joint appointments shall teach POLS or PSPA courses, do research, and carry out service duties of a regular full-time Political Science faculty member in proportion to the percentage of their appointment in the Political Science Department. These teaching, research, and service responsibilities will be delineated in the memorandum of understanding, taking into account departmental priorities and needs. The memorandum will also note that changes in the work load of full-time faculty will be accompanied by changes in the work loads of faculty on joint appointments. The memorandum will specify which parts of the faculty member's teaching, research or service shall be evaluated by the department and which by the other unit.

8. The right to vote in departmental meetings and to serve on the elected committees of the department shall extend to all tenure-track joint appointment faculty who have at least one-half of their time designated to the department and who fulfill their obligations to the department as specified in paragraph 7(e) above and in the memo of understanding.

Appendix 1 (Amended 28 May, 2021)

General

Annals of the American Academy
Electoral Studies
Journal of Democracy
Journal of Experimental Political Science
Journal of Law and Courts
Journal of Political Economy
Journal of Theoretical Politics
Legislative Studies Quarterly
Perspectives on Politics
Political Analysis
Political Behavior
Political Research Quarterly
Political Studies
Politics and Religion
Politics and Society
Political Science Quarterly
Polity
PS: Political Science and Politics
Publius
Social Science Quarterly
Social Science Research

American Politics

American Politics Research
Law and Society Review
Journal of Law and Courts
Journal of Urban Affairs
Politics and Gender
Public Opinion Quarterly
State Politics and Policy Quarterly
Studies in American Political Development
Urban Studies

Comparative Politics

Asian Survey
Canadian Journal of Political Science
China Quarterly
Comparative Political Studies
Comparative Politics
Comparative Studies in Society and History
Democratization
Development and Change
European Journal of Political Research

European Political Science Review
Journal of East Asian Studies
Journal of European Public Policy
Pacific Affairs
Post-Soviet Affairs
Studies in Comparative and International Development

International Relations

Conflict Management and Peace Science
European Journal of International Relations
Foreign Affairs
International Affairs
International Interactions
International Political Science Review
International Security
International Studies Quarterly
Journal of Conflict Resolution
Journal of Global Security Studies
Journal of Peace Research
Review of International Political Economy
Review of International Studies
Security Studies

Political Theory

Constellations
Ethics
European Journal of Political Theory
History of Political Thought
Interpretation: A Journal of Political Philosophy
Journal of the History of Ideas
Journal of Political Philosophy
Philosophy and Public Affairs
Political Theory
Review of Politics

Other

American Journal of International Law
Environment and Behavior
Governance
Government and Opposition
Journal of Law and Economics
Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization
Journal of Policy Analysis and Management
Policy Studies Journal
Public Administration
Public Choice

Public Administration Review
Theory and Society

Appendix 2

American Journal of Political Science
American Political Science Review
British Journal of Political Science
International Organization
Journal of Politics
World Politics