Faculty members must consult the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual. In the event of a conflict between the two documents, the college manual takes precedence.

All materials, discussions, conclusions, and letters that are part of the review process will be held in strictest confidence, and no party to the process, other than the candidate, may divulge any information about it to anyone not directly involved.
INTRODUCTION

The History Department takes great effort and care to hire and retain the very best faculty. It fully expects that each of these faculty will meet or exceed the requirements for tenure and for promotion at all ranks. To that end, the department is committed to doing all it can to support the work of its faculty so that they may contribute to their particular field of history and to the work of the university.

The College of Arts and Sciences, in order to help make the evaluation process for promotion and tenure rigorous yet fair, asks each department to write its own set of guidelines to describe discipline-specific criteria for promotion and tenure. The guidelines of the Department of History express the philosophy that will guide departmental evaluators and provide candidates a clear description of departmental expectations and procedures. Each candidate, in turn, should consult both the Georgia State University Promotion and Tenure Manual for Tenured and Tenure-Track Professors and also the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual, for guidance in preparing and submitting the dossier portion of their applications for tenure and promotion, and for details of the University and College expectations.

The Department of History evaluates all candidates in three areas of professional life: professional development, teaching, and service. As will be described later in this document, the department values all of these areas highly and has established specific expectations for performance by its members in each one. The College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual states that for a candidate to be awarded tenure and promoted to the rank of Associate Professor, he or she is expected a) to have developed a substantial body of work that has already contributed to the advancement of his/her discipline as determined by peers within and outside the University and b) have a record of growth in research, scholarship, and creative
accomplishments that demonstrates a strong likelihood of a continued upward trajectory.

Candidates for promotion to associate professor should be establishing a national reputation in their field. They must also demonstrate high quality teaching and evidence of effective service appropriate to their rank.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The Department of History views professional development as encompassing various activities that advance our discipline by creating or extending historical knowledge and modes of inquiry. While the essential core of professional development is research and its dissemination, professional development also includes all other activities that support or enhance research in the field, including reporting at professional meetings; reviewing, editing, or refereeing other publications; creating historical knowledge resources (such as the generation of oral histories, archival collections, or archeological findings, for instance); and interpreting history for or with public constituencies in a variety of media (such as exhibitions, digital resources, film and video, or government reports). Research outcomes should be judged on whether they are appropriate to stated goals and whether they produce valuable products. Success can be achieved in a number of ways, although the department recognizes that the field of history is normally a book-oriented discipline.

Candidates will be evaluated on the whole body of their work. The department’s goal is to foster production of high-quality scholarship, and every candidate must meet that standard. Since peer review is one of the fundamental principles of scholarship, we will rely heavily on that process and on comparable peer review scrutiny. Work that has not been refereed will be given little credit. In general, textbooks and pedagogical works will be considered as
contributions to teaching unless the text can be shown to make significant or seminal
ccontributions to the scholarship of the field.

Obtaining extramural grant support for one’s research is a highly valued professional
development activity, especially for tenured faculty, and success in seeking grant support,
particularly from national sources, will weigh heavily as evidence of scholarly reputation. Grant
support is a means to an end, so that publications or other final products are expected to follow.

Scholarly activities such as organizing sessions for professional meetings and reviewing,
refereeing, and editing the work of others also are valued activities. In special subfields historical
research may more commonly take the form of critical documentary editions, major websites,
new artifact or source collections, historical register nominations, museum exhibitions, or other
interpretive products of value.

The department recognizes that a loose hierarchy of scholarly journals exists in the
various fields and subfields of history. It recognizes that valuable work that offers innovative
approaches, new ideas, or evidence that challenges existing knowledge may not be published in
the best-known journals and presses. It further recognizes that important contributions to
scholarship may appear in new forms of refereed media such as web-based journals, and edited
databases.

The department evaluates a candidate’s publishing record by a variety of criteria,
including but not limited to 1) the work’s impact on the field, shown through reviews, citations,
honors and awards, or other evidence; 2) the prestige or standing of the journal in which an
article appears or the publisher of a book or book chapter; 3) the candidate’s explanation of the
importance of the work; 4) the comments of outside reviewers in the promotion and tenure
review process; and 5) the Committee’s own evaluation of the work.
For public history and other subfields, the department assesses quality around a similar set of criteria as appropriate to the field: 1) a work’s impact on the field, shown through reviews, citations, honors and awards, or other evidence; 2) originality, quality, and success in engaging stakeholders, public audiences, or other constituencies; 3) the candidate’s explanation of the importance of his or her work; 4) the comments of outside reviewers in the promotion and tenure process; and 5) the Committee’s own assessment of a candidate’s work.

Perhaps the issue of most concern to candidates is the number of publications required for promotion and tenure. The College mandates that individual departments set the requirements for meeting the standard for promotion and tenure. Toward this end, the department offers guideline numbers, with the understanding that there is no absolute magic number. A smaller number of works of outstanding quality might be evaluated as equal or superior to a greater number of publications of lesser quality. Because history is a book-based discipline, the book will in most cases constitute the major portion of the candidate’s research activity and will—again in most cases—be given far more weight than any other form of publication in making determinations of scholarly productivity. For historians, journal articles and chapters in edited volumes are also substantial pieces of work, of significant length and impact. They often involve work over more than one year and research in numerous archives in locations requiring national or international travel. Therefore we also regard articles and chapters as important contributions to scholarship. The department also recognizes that there may be scholars with academic appointments in the History Department who work in other disciplines or in subfields of history in which articles rather than books are the primary and most influential form of publication, although in those cases the Department urges candidates to explain clearly that national/international reputations in
their specialized sub-field typically are generated through the publication of articles and/or book chapters rather than monographs.

**Categories of Professional Development**

The candidate for promotion and tenure must submit written evidence of professional development organized according to the categories of professional development listed in the college manual (section V.E.). Types of evidence include: 1) books and monographs, scholarly writings in journals, chapters in books, and book reviews; 2) awards and grants; 3) presentations at professional meetings; 4) significant professional services; 5) general recognition within one’s discipline; 6) recognition by national, scholarly, and professional associations; and 7) specialized professional activities appropriate to the discipline, particularly for specialized subfields. In addition to the items enumerated below, the candidate must provide copies of all publications and grant proposals listed. Clear documentation must be provided for works accepted for publication. Work in progress and work submitted but not yet accepted for publication may not be included. In the absence of a publications record that self-evidently meets the requirements for promotion to a given rank, the candidate is expected to offer a compelling rationale for the importance, direction, and progress of his or her research since initial appointment to the department or since promotion to the candidate’s current rank.

1. Books and Monographs, Scholarly Writings in Journals, Chapters in Books, and Book Reviews
   
   A. Books and Monographs
   
   The candidate should provide a list of books or monographs published or accepted for publication. This list should include the title, publisher, date (or projected date) of publication, and a brief description of the work and its contribution to the field of history. For
works accepted for publication, clear indication should be given of the item’s scheduled publication date, with supporting documentation.

B. Published Articles

The candidate should provide a list of published articles and those accepted for publication. The list should include for each article the title, the journal, volume, date (or projected date) of publication and a brief description of the article and its contribution to the field of history and to the candidate’s subfield. For works accepted for publication, clear indication should be given of the item’s scheduled publication date, with supporting documentation.

C. Chapters in Books

The candidate should provide a list of chapters that have been published in edited books and those accepted for publication. This list should include for each chapter the title of the chapter, the title of the book, the book’s editor(s), the publisher, the date (or projected date) of publication, and a brief description of the chapter and its contribution to the field of history and to the candidate’s subfield. For works accepted for publication, clear indication should be given of the item’s scheduled publication date, with supporting documentation.

D. Book Reviews

The candidate should provide a list of book reviews published or accepted for publication, including the author and title of the book reviewed, its place of appearance, and the date (or projected date) of publication.

2. Awards and Grants

The candidate should provide a list of all research grants and awards, and all fellowships, travel awards, and personal development grants that supported the candidate’s scholarly research and professional development. This list should include the title of each successful application, the
awarding agency, the amount and period of the award, and the precise nature of the research project. The candidate must also provide copies of official letters of award. Candidates may also include lists of unfunded applications as evidence of one’s effort to obtain outside funding for research and writing.

3. Presentations at Professional Meetings

The candidate should provide a list of presentations at professional meetings. This list should include the title of the presentation, the type of presentation (paper, invited paper or speech, symposium presentation, or roundtable discussion), the name, location, and date of the meeting, and a one- or two-sentence description of the presentation.

4. Significant Professional Services

Significant professional services in History include serving as a journal editor or associate editor, member of an editorial board, referee for scholarly journals or granting agencies, member of the program committee for a conference or of a review panel for proposals, and consultant for professional organizations and public agencies. The candidate should provide a list that includes the activity, organization, and dates of service.

5. General Recognition Within the Discipline of History

Invitations received for colloquium presentations or workshops at professional associations or other universities, and reviews and citations of published work will be viewed as evidence of scholarly reputation. The candidate should provide a list of titles, locations, and dates for invited presentations and, in the case of reviews and citations, a complete bibliographic citation of the works in which they appear.

6. Recognition by National, Scholarly, and Professional Associations
Honors, such as fellow status, and awards from scholarly and professional associations that result from the candidate’s research contributions will be viewed as evidence of scholarly reputation.

7. Professional Activities in Specialized Subfields in the Discipline of History.

The Department of History recognizes the importance to the discipline of specialized subfields. Materials from areas of professional development that do not fit into any other category may be included here. These materials may not include work in progress or work submitted but not yet accepted for publication or dissemination. The candidate should provide a list of activities, locations, dates, and a brief description of each project, its outcomes, and its contribution to the field of history and to the candidate’s subfield. In the case of collaborative work, the candidate should define their role, particularly in terms of the creation or extension of historical knowledge.

**Evaluation of Professional Development**

Based on the evidence submitted, the departmental Committee will evaluate the candidate’s professional development in accordance with the guidelines in the College and University manuals.

**PROMOTION TO AND/OR TENURE AT THE RANK OF ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR**

In order for the candidate to be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of associate professor she or he must be evaluated as *excellent* in the category of professional development. The successful candidate will have developed a substantial body of work that has contributed to the advancement of the discipline. In the discipline of History, this is normally achieved through the production of a single-authored monograph, published with a reputable university or trade press. The historical monograph is more than the sum of its chapters in terms
of impact—the book represents substantial research in multiple archives, sometimes with the
significant additional challenges of research in a foreign country and in a foreign language.

Normally a candidate will have the published book in hand at the time that he or she is being
considered for promotion and tenure. We recognize that the production schedule of a book is not
entirely under the control of an author, and may not always correspond to the promotion and
tenure cycle. In those cases where a publisher has given final approval but then introduced
delays, resulting in delayed publication or a book merely “in press,” candidates should provide
documentation from their publisher. A candidate must also have at least one significant article in
a refereed journal or similar refereed medium, and/or at least one significant book chapter. In
addition, candidates should be able to demonstrate contributions to the field through other
professional activities such as the publication of book reviews, collections and anthologies, or
other evidence of scholarly activity; giving papers and chairing and commenting at conferences
held by professional organizations; playing a significant role in a national professional or
scholarly organization; or sustained efforts to obtain outside funding for research and writing.

The body of the candidate’s work must be recognized by his or her peers as being of high quality
and making important scholarly contributions. The candidate should provide evidence to
demonstrate the national (or international) impact of his or her work such as reviews of
published work, citations, inclusion of his or her work in course syllabi; invitations to speak;
invitations to write reviews or referee manuscripts for publication; honors and awards, or other
evidence. The candidate’s work and professional development statement should indicate a
strong upward trajectory in terms of high quality and productive research.

The departmental Committee recognizes that not all subfields of History operate in the
same fashion. In some subfields, a national (or international) reputation may be established
through a substantial body of research, publications, or other activities that do not result in a
single-authored monograph. In such cases, it is incumbent upon the candidate to demonstrate
how their activities realize the standards of their subfield for the development of a national (or
international) reputation through a substantial body of professional work.

PROMOTION TO AND/OR TENURE AT THE RANK OF PROFESSOR

In order for the candidate to be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank
of professor, she or he must be evaluated as excellent in the category of professional
development. The successful candidate at this level must have developed a substantial body of
work that has contributed to the advancement of the discipline. This work must represent
substantially new research beyond that for which the candidate was awarded promotion to the
rank of Associate Professor, and should demonstrate that the candidate has achieved and
sustained a national and international reputation in a field of the discipline. In the discipline of
History, this is normally achieved through the production of a single-authored monograph,
published with a reputable university or trade press. Candidates must also have either articles in
major refereed journals and/or significant book chapters. In addition, candidates should be able
to demonstrate contributions to the field through other professional activities such as the
publication of book reviews, collections and anthologies, or other evidence of scholarly activity;
giving papers and chairing and commenting at conferences held by professional organizations;
sustained efforts to obtain outside funding for research and writing; or playing a significant role
in a national professional or scholarly organization. The body of the candidate’s work must be
recognized by his or her peers as being of high quality and making important scholarly
contributions. The candidate should provide evidence to demonstrate the national and
international impact of his or her work such as reviews of a candidate’s published work; citations by other scholars; inclusion of one’s scholarship in course syllabi; national recognition in one’s field; honors and awards; invitations to speak, or invitations to write reviews or referee manuscripts for publication; or other evidence. The candidate’s work and professional development statement should indicate a continued trajectory in terms of high quality and productive research.

The departmental committee recognizes that at the senior level, a substantial body of scholarly research may take other forms. In such cases, it is incumbent upon the candidate to demonstrate how their activities realize the standards of their subfield for the development of a national and international reputation through a substantial body of professional work.

TEACHING

Categories of Teaching

The quality of instruction of faculty members is of paramount importance to the department and university. The Department of History believes that all faculty are responsible for high-quality teaching, irrespective of rank. All candidates must submit written evidence of effective teaching organized according to the categories of teaching listed in the college manual (section V.F.). Types of evidence include: 1) syllabi and list of courses taught; 2) student course evaluations; 3) honors; 4) evidence of instructional service beyond the classroom; 5) published materials; and 6) other materials. The candidate may not solicit letters to include in any of these categories.
1. **Syllabi and List of Courses Taught**

The candidate must include the most recent syllabus for each course taught during the last four years. Only one syllabus for each different course should be provided. The candidate must list the courses taught during this period using the format specified by the College Manual. The candidate may include supplementary materials to document the quality of course content (see item 6, “Other Materials,” below). In keeping with the *College Policy on Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness for Full-Time Faculty*, the departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee will review syllabi “for conformity with university guidelines, differentiation of graduate and undergraduate expectations, reading / assignments appropriate to course level and catalog description.”

2. **Student Course Evaluations**

The candidate must include standardized course evaluations for every course s/he has taught during the last four years in the tabular format detailed in the College Manual.

3. **Honors**

Honors or other special recognition of the quality of a candidate’s teaching should be listed in tabular form (as detailed in the College Manual). The candidate also should submit evidence of honors his/her students have achieved, which are directly connected with the candidate’s teaching or mentorship (such as papers presented, accepted for publication, or published, fellowships or other rewards received, and acceptance to graduate programs).

4. **Evidence of Instructional Service Beyond the Classroom**

The candidate should provide lists of the following types of instructional service: organizing or presenting in departmental seminars on pedagogy; supervision of directed reading or independent study courses; direction of honors theses; membership on master’s paper or master’s
thesis committees and/or direction of master’s papers or master’s theses; membership on
dissertation committees and/or direction of dissertations; involvement in preparation and/or
grading of departmental MA or Ph.D. examinations; references written on behalf of students;
supervision of internships; advisement of students; and evidence of students’ successful
endeavors connected with the candidate’s mentorship. The College Manual specifies a particular
tabular form for conveying much of the information in this section, to which the candidate
should adhere.

5. Published Materials

The candidate should provide a list of textbooks and other published materials related to his/her
teaching. The candidate should provide a one- or two-sentence description of the contribution
of each item to the teaching of history.

6. Other Materials

The candidate may include materials that demonstrate teaching preparation, effectiveness of
pedagogical methodology, and pedagogical creativity, such as: course handouts and assignments;
descriptions of learning exercises; tests; outstanding student papers or other written/visual
evidence of course-generated student projects. The College Policy on Assessment of Teaching
Effectiveness for Full-Time Faculty specifies that “course materials should...be assessed for
their appropriateness in relation to the current state of knowledge in the field.” The policy further
states that faculty should be rewarded for “enhancing creativity and independent critical
thinking,” and for structuring courses “in ways that cultivate curiosity, creativity, and critical
acumen in their students.” The candidate should submit supplementary material (in addition to
syllabi) for two courses per year, in keeping with the procedures for Annual Review.
Supplementary materials should demonstrate the range and variety of levels of courses the candidate has taught.

**Evaluation of Teaching**

The quality of teaching by faculty members is of paramount importance to the Department and the University. The candidate for promotion and/or tenure should submit written evidence of successful teaching organized in the categories set forth in the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual. The departmental committee will evaluate the quality of teaching in keeping with the College Manual’s evaluative categories based on the evidence submitted. In making its rankings the departmental Committee on Promotion and Tenure should consider the evidence to determine the candidate’s success in teaching and his or her commitment to teaching and its improvement. Teaching should be considered both within the classroom and outside the classroom. The committee may need to give more or less weight to each component depending on the circumstances of individual candidates.

Within the classroom, a faculty member should be prepared for class, teach courses reflecting the current state of the discipline, have syllabi prepared according to the standards of the College and University, be available to students outside the classroom, give assignments that are well prepared and used effectively to encourage learning and analytical thinking, have his/her students do work that teaches analytical thinking and improves writing skills, and provide a positive learning environment. In considering student perceptions of the candidate’s teaching through student course evaluations, the committee will take into account such factors as the type of course. The committee will also consider the candidate’s efforts and commitment to teaching success and innovation by evaluating evidence of teaching preparation and pedagogical
creativity, such as the creative use of technology, assignments, learning exercises, or other techniques to enhance student learning.

Outside the classroom, a faculty member should strive to support student learning through such activities as writing and evaluating graduate comprehensive examinations, chairing or serving on honors thesis, masters thesis, and doctoral dissertation committees, sponsoring student organizations or teams, preparing graduate students for the job market, advising graduate and undergraduate students, developing and revising curricula and courses, aiding in instructional leadership and coordination, leading departmental seminars on pedagogy and advising, developing and supervising internships, developing and supervising directed readings and independent studies, publishing textbooks or pedagogical research, receiving grants for instructional purposes, participating in pedagogical continuing education, and helping graduate students in presenting papers, publishing, and/or job placement. Faculty members can also show evidence of teaching success by highlighting successful student endeavors connected with their supervision.

In rating the candidates, the committee needs to consider their academic rank and the availability of graduate students with compatible research interests. Other things equal, candidates for professor should have considerably more involvement with graduate students than candidates for associate professor.

PROMOTION TO AND/OR TENURE AT THE RANK OF ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

To be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of associate professor, a candidate must be evaluated as excellent in teaching. The candidate will be evaluated as excellent in teaching if the clear impression garnered by the committee from the evidence
submitted is that the candidate’s teaching and contributions to teaching are superb (while being mindful of the range, type, and size of classes being taught). For instance, the student evaluation scores must suggest highly effective performance in the classroom; course material must show impressive preparation and incorporation of up-to-date scholarship in specialized courses; the candidate must demonstrate highly effective mentoring of students. The candidate may also have published pedagogical works or been nominated for one or more teaching awards. Candidates may also have demonstrated significant improvement in teaching over the period under review.

PROMOTION TO AND/OR TENURE AT THE RANK OF PROFESSOR

To be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of professor, a candidate must be evaluated as excellent in teaching. To achieve an evaluation of excellent, a candidate for promotion to the rank of professor must demonstrate continued success in teaching and a strong commitment to student learning (again while being mindful of the range, type, and size of classes being taught). For instance, the student evaluation scores must suggest highly effective performance in the classroom; course material must show impressive preparation and incorporation of up-to-date scholarship in specialized courses; the candidate must demonstrate highly effective mentoring of students. The candidate may also have published pedagogical works or been nominated for one or more teaching awards. Normally, candidates for promotion to professor will demonstrate increased graduate or honors supervisions while also maintaining the high standards for effectiveness, preparation, mentoring, and innovation described above.
SERVICE

Service to one’s colleagues, to the department, to the College, and to the University is a very important element in judging a faculty member’s contribution and performance. Service to one’s academic discipline, usually by participating in the operation of professional associations as officers or committee or board members, is another important component in evaluating a faculty member’s service contributions. Specialized subfields such as historical preservation, oral history, and teacher education that lend themselves to discipline-related forms of community and public service are recognized and valued by the History Department. Neither the College nor the Department of History asks the same quantity and quality of service contributions from faculty in junior and senior ranks.

Categories of Service

The candidate must submit documentation of service activity related to his/her areas of professional competence organized according to the categories of service listed in the college manual (section V.G.).

Evaluation of Service

Based on the evidence submitted, the departmental committee will evaluate the candidate’s service relative to the college manual’s standards of good and very good, based on the present rank of the candidate and in accordance with the departmental guidelines and college and university manuals.

PROMOTION TO AND/OR TENURE AT THE RANK OF ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

In order for the candidate to be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of associate professor, she or he must be evaluated as at least good in the area of service. The
successful candidate must demonstrate active assistance to colleagues and must have responsibly carried out the service tasks assigned to him or her.

PROMOTION TO AND/OR TENURE AT THE RANK OF PROFESSOR

In order for the candidate to be recommended for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of professor, she or he must be evaluated as very good in the area of service. The successful candidate must demonstrate not merely active assistance to colleagues and the responsible fulfillment of the departmental service tasks assigned to him or her but also effective service beyond that required as a responsible member of the department. Among the myriad ways to achieve this goal the candidate may have served in leadership capacities such as Undergraduate Director, Graduate Director, or other major service roles. The candidate must also demonstrate significant and effective service beyond the department at the college, or university, and/or professional level.

EVALUATION PROCESS

The process and schedule for applying for promotion and tenure in the Department of History is governed by the college manual. Applications for tenure and promotion to associate professor will be evaluated by the departmental P&T I Committee, consisting of all departmental faculty with tenure and at the rank of associate professor or above. Applications for promotion to the rank of professor and for tenure at that rank will be judged by the departmental P&T II Committee, composed of all tenured full professors.

An important part of the departmental evaluation is the assessment of the candidate’s credentials by recognized specialists outside of Georgia State University. The candidate must submit with his / her dossier a list of eight scholars in the candidate’s subfield(s) who are
qualified to evaluate the candidate’s performance in the area of professional development and his / her reputation within the discipline. The departmental chair, together with the departmental Committee on Promotion and Tenure, will prepare a list of eight additional scholars who could perform the assessment role. Detailed requirements for these lists are included in the college manual (section V.H.). Both lists will be submitted to the Office of the Dean, who will review them and select the external reviewers to be contacted. The letters supplied by these outside reviewers will be considered at all levels of review in the University.
APPENDIX I:
THIRD-YEAR PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW

Introduction

The Department of History reviews all faculty members during their third year of employment. The purpose of this review, which assesses the faculty member’s effectiveness in Professional Development, Teaching, and Service, is to ensure that junior faculty members have a candid and constructive evaluation of their accomplishments as they progress toward an eventual promotion and tenure decision.

The faculty member under review should be familiar with the Department’s promotion and tenure guidelines and should use those guidelines to construct the dossier. But the spirit of the third-year review is different from that of the promotion and tenure process. Although very important, the third-year review is also more informal. It is meant to encourage a candid assessment of the faculty member’s achievements to date. If there are deficiencies in a particular area, those concerns will be acknowledged, and the Chair and the faculty member will discuss specific ways to improve over the next three years. If the faculty member seems to be progressing toward a successful promotion and tenure decision, the Chair will acknowledge such progress. The Department wishes to nurture the faculty member so that, ideally, she or he will be in the best possible position at the time of application for promotion and tenure. Faculty beginning their review may also wish to consult the College guidelines: http://casservice.gsu.edu/policies-forms/tenure-track-faculty-policies/.

Process

1. By January 1 the Chair will ask members of the faculty in their third year to prepare and submit, by the sixth week of the spring semester, a dossier for third-year promotion and tenure review.

2. The faculty member under review should assemble a brief dossier containing a two-page statement of goals and accomplishments in the areas of Professional Development, Teaching, and Service, as well as annual reports, a curriculum vita, publications/creative achievements, and evidence of teaching effectiveness.

3. After due deliberations, Departmental Advisory Committee members shall prepare an objective summary report on the dossier. Because history is a book-based discipline, in the professional development category the committee will in most cases evaluate progress toward the book. Many reviewees will not have completed a book since the publication of a book is a multi-year project. In addition, some colleagues will be in fields in which the book not a necessary or even usual path to achieving a national reputation. In all cases, though, the onus is on the faculty member under review to show progress toward establishing a national reputation, which can be done in multiple ways: through the publication of portions of their research in article-form, through a publication contract offered on the basis of a completed manuscript, or simply by including the manuscript as it exists in the third-year dossier.
4. The Chair shall hold a conference to inform the faculty member how well he or she is progressing toward a positive promotion and tenure decision. The Chair will also give the faculty member a copy of his or her report.

5. The Chair shall forward to the Dean of the College all relevant reports, and the Dean shall meet with the faculty member and the Chair to discuss the review.

**Terms of Evaluation**

**Professional Development**

For the purposes of the third-year review, **professional development** shall normally be evaluated according to the following standard:

**Poor:** The faculty member maintains no program of professional development.

**Fair:** The faculty member is largely inactive in professional development.

**Good:** The faculty member is minimally active in maintaining a program of professional development, or the scope and impact of the professional development contributions are insufficient.

**Very Good:** The faculty member, while maintaining an active program of professional development, has yet to be recognized as an emerging leader in his or her field, but there are clear indications that he or she has projects underway that are likely to result in a more prominent scholarly profile in the near future. For example, the faculty member may have published one significant article in a reputable peer-reviewed journal or a chapter in an influential peer-reviewed book of significance within the field and can show progress toward a completed book manuscript or some other path toward a national reputation.

**Excellent:** The faculty member has achieved, or is likely to achieve, a national reputation for her or his scholarship. This reputation may be demonstrated in various ways. The faculty member may have a book currently in production, or he or she may have a book contract and a substantially completed manuscript; he or she may have published and/or had accepted for publication at least two articles or book chapters, and/or won a major grant. Most importantly, the faculty member must be able to demonstrate his or her progress in concrete ways beyond forthcoming works. We direct faculty to the description of how professional development will be evaluated during the Promotion and Tenure process as it is outlined in the P&T guidelines, and note especially the distinctions made there between a publication “in hand” and one “in press.”

**Outstanding:** The faculty member has achieved eminence in his or her field, demonstrated by the fact that his or her scholarship has perhaps won awards, earned laudatory reviews in major publications, or resulted in invitations to give lectures in prestigious venues, and so on.

For those candidates who are not in fields that privilege the book, different standards may apply based on the reviewee’s explanation of research productivity and trajectory.
Teaching

For the purposes of the third-year review, teaching shall be evaluated according to the following standard:

**Poor:** The faculty member does not fulfill his or her duties as an instructor.

**Fair:** The faculty member inconsistently or ineffectively executes his or her duties as an instructor. Course syllabi give evidence of incomplete understanding of the field; course preparation is lacking, inconsistent, or otherwise deficient. Student perceptions of the course express wide dissatisfaction.

**Good:** The faculty member does not always effectively execute one’s duties as an instructor. Course syllabi are incomplete or unhelpful; course preparation is lacking, inconsistent, or otherwise deficient. Student perceptions of the course express wide dissatisfaction.

**Very Good:** The faculty member’s teaching is competent; Syllabi show command of the field and a creative approach to disseminating knowledge. Students express satisfaction with the instructor. Nonetheless, it is important to recognize that teaching defined as very good is still below the quality necessary for promotion and tenure.

**Excellent:** The excellent teacher shows consistently high levels of achievement in multiple categories for assessing teaching. His or her course materials illustrate a trajectory as an accomplished teacher who continually strives to improve his or her pedagogy. Normally, his or her student evaluations are consistently high. Additionally, he or she might have a track record of developing new courses or protocols for existing courses and/or successfully mentoring undergraduate or graduate students.

**Outstanding:** In addition to the criteria of excellent teaching described below, the faculty member may have extraordinarily high expressions of student satisfaction; won a teaching award; produced pedagogical publications like a textbook; and/or supervised the work of an extraordinary number of undergraduate or graduate students.

Service

For the purposes of the third-year review, service shall be evaluated according to the following categories:

**Poor:** Faculty members judged to be poor in service do not fulfill assigned service obligations and are not responsible citizens of the department.

**Fair:** Faculty members judged to be fair in service ineffectively fulfill assigned service obligations or are not responsible citizens of the department.

**Good:** Faculty members judged to be good in service conscientiously and effectively fulfill assigned departmental tasks.
**Very Good:** Faculty members judged to be *very good* in service conscientiously and effectively fulfill assigned tasks not only in the department, but also at the College and/or University level.

**Excellent:** The candidate will be judged to be *excellent* in service if they have been highly effective as they carried out assigned responsibilities and contributed significantly to the mission of the department over a sustained period. In addition he or she has performed significant College and/or University service; He or she may also have served the profession in significant and effective ways, and/or has provided an exceptional degree of service to the community or to government.

**Outstanding:** Outstanding service, in addition to the elements defined as *excellent* above, has also merited recognition and/or award.
APPENDIX II:
RATINGS GUIDELINES FOR POST-TENURE REVIEW

Professional Development

Poor: The faculty member maintains no program of professional development.

Fair: The faculty member is largely inactive in professional development.

Good: The faculty member is minimally active in maintaining a program of professional development and/or the scope and impact of the faculty member’s professional development contributions are insufficient.

Very Good: The faculty member’s professional development record indicates steady scholarly development that has not yet resulted in the completion of major high quality projects.

Excellent: The faculty member has continued to maintain and advance a distinguished national or international reputation as an authority in his or her area(s) of specialization. The faculty member continues to be an active scholar, and has a marked impact on the work of others in the field. His or her scholarship is held in esteem by the profession, and reviews of and citations to the faculty member’s work (including those of previously published works) attest to this reputation. Other important evidence may include the securing of fellowships, grants, contracts, and/or awards from internal and external local, regional, national, or international agencies.

Outstanding: The faculty member has achieved eminence in his or her field, as evidenced by national or international awards, strong reviews in major publication outlets, invited lectures at prestigious venues and so on.

Teaching

Poor: The faculty member does not fulfill his or her duties as an instructor.

Fair: The faculty member inconsistently or ineffectively executes his or her duties as an instructor. Course syllabi give evidence of incomplete understanding of the field; course preparation is lacking, inconsistent, or otherwise deficient. Student perceptions of the course express wide dissatisfaction.

Good: The faculty member’s instructional performance barely exceeds adequate. This faculty member’s supporting materials provide evidence of conscientious preparation and pertinent, valid content, but fail to demonstrate either exceptional pedagogical skill or decisive commitment to the wide-ranging institutional and intellectual responsibilities of a full-time college instructor. The learning environment in this faculty member’s classroom, as reflected in student evaluations, achievement, and advancement, is adequate but not distinctly positive.

Very Good: The faculty member is a competent teacher whose supporting material includes evidence not only of diligent preparation and instruction but also of some mentoring of students,
effective pedagogy, and a commitment to the mission of the department. Class assignments are
creative and methodologically innovative, resulting in proficient student learning. While the
faculty member is an effective teacher, her/his teaching record may lack the level and extent of
involvement in the supervision of individual student work that is typically expected for a rating
of excellent, as described below.

**Excellent:** The faculty member’s teaching record shows exceptional preparation and extensive
contributions to the development of individual graduate students as demonstrated, for example,
by the successful direction to completion of student work. Students express wide satisfaction
with the faculty member’s teaching. The faculty member evaluated as excellent also will have
demonstrated a substantial variety of activities related to instruction as well as innovative
pedagogy.

**Outstanding:** In excess of the criteria for a rating of excellent, the faculty member will have
won a significant teaching award from a prestigious outlet, and/or published highly regarded
pedagogical studies, and/or will have been otherwise recognized for superior instruction.

**Service**

**Poor:** Faculty members judged to be poor in service do not fulfill assigned service obligations
and are not responsible citizens of the department.

**Fair:** Faculty members judged to be fair in service ineffectively fulfill assigned service
obligations or are not responsible citizens of the department.

**Good:** The faculty member responsibly and thoroughly executes assigned departmental duties
and committee responsibilities and is of significant assistance to colleagues.

**Very Good:** The faculty member demonstrates extensive, collegial, diligent, and effective
service and leadership at the department and either the college or the university levels as well as
participating in professional associations.

**Excellent:** The faculty member demonstrates a track record of effective leadership that has
involved significant departmental or other college or university administrative functions. Such
leadership is in addition to the level of service described above as very good.

**Outstanding:** In addition to the level of service described above as excellent, the faculty
member demonstrates a record of sustained, significant service accomplishments beyond the
department and throughout the college and university, as well as in national and international
professional organizations.