

HISTORY DEPARTMENT -- Promotion and Tenure Guidelines  
**Discussed, revised and 1<sup>st</sup> vote on 10/10/2019 and 2<sup>nd</sup> vote approved 11/18/2019**

A. Standards for Promotion

Since the mission of the University encompasses teaching, scholarship, and service, faculty members must strive for excellence in all three areas.

Promotion to Associate Professor

Candidates for Associate Professor must publish, or have accepted for publication, a scholarly book or its equivalent in the form of several substantial articles in refereed journals of professional stature. For faculty whose primary mode of scholarship is digital humanities or public history, including museums, candidates may alternatively produce a combination of substantial articles in refereed journals of professional stature and/or digital scholarship, public history projects, or exhibitions representing creative work, as per the AHA guidelines on evaluation of digital scholarship:

<https://www.historians.org/teaching-and-learning/digital-history-resources/evaluation-of-digital-scholarship-in-history/guidelines-for-the-professional-evaluation-of-digital-scholarship-by-historians>. While published results from dissertation research may form the substance of promotion dossiers, the candidates must present evidence of continuing productivity. Although service to the department, college, University, community, or profession must not be neglected, and an unsatisfactory service record would preclude promotion, a candidate for promotion must have a strong record in both teaching and research. A merely satisfactory record in teaching or research is not sufficient for promotion; the work of a successful candidate must be judged “excellent” in research and “excellent” or “high quality” in teaching. The criteria for judgment are described in Section B. The Department does not discriminate on the basis of time in rank.

Promotion to Professor

Candidates for Professor must continue their research activities while Associate Professors and publish, or have accepted for publication, an additional scholarly book or its equivalent in substantial articles published in refereed journals of professional stature. For faculty whose primary mode of scholarship is digital humanities or public history, including museums, candidates may alternatively produce a combination of substantial articles in refereed journals of professional stature and/or digital scholarship, public history projects, or exhibitions representing

creative work, as per the AHA guidelines on evaluation of digital scholarship:  
<https://www.historians.org/teaching-and-learning/digital-history-resources/evaluation-of-digital-scholarship-in-history/guidelines-for-the-professional-evaluation-of-digital-scholarship-by-historians>. There must be unmistakable evidence of significant achievement in both teaching and research since the last promotion. This rank is reserved for individuals who have established reputations in the profession and whose contributions to the University's mission are unquestioned. The Department does not discriminate on the basis of time in rank.

Evaluation of reputation, a requirement for promotion to Professor, shall be based on the following:

- a. Grants or Prizes
- b. Reviews and other written evaluations of the candidate's work by experts in the field.
- c. Appointment to the editorship of scholarly journals or series.
- d. Invitations to review books, manuscripts, and proposals.
- e. Membership on editorial boards and the councils of professional organizations.
- f. Invitations to present papers, lecture, or participate as discussant.
- g. Letters from peers on the candidate's standing in the profession.
- h. Reprints in anthologies or translations of published works in non-English journals and books.
- i. Projects in public history, including but not limited to websites or exhibitions, consulting for cultural institutions including museums and historical societies, etc., or digital history projects; based upon such criteria as original research, interpretation, and peer reviews where applicable.

Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor must have a strong record of service, and their work must be judged "excellent" in research and "excellent" or "high quality" in teaching. The criteria for judgment are described in Section B.

B. Evaluation Criteria

Teaching

The Promotion and Tenure Committee shall judge teaching by the following criteria:

- a. Classroom evaluations by peers which consider subject-knowledge, organization and clarity, ability to stimulate interest, ability to lead discussions.
- b. Student course evaluations administered according to Department procedures. In weighing the evaluations, circumstances such as type, size and time of courses shall be considered.
- c. Appraisal of syllabi, reading lists, new course development, course revisions, and of the range of courses taught.
- d. Consistently good enrollments, taking into account the nature of the subjects taught and the level of the courses.

Additional evidence on teaching may be submitted as is appropriate for individual candidates:

- a. Supervision of M.A., Ph.D., and Undergraduate honors theses.
- b. Teaching awards or improvement of instruction grants.
- c. Statements of former students.
- d. Success of students (especially graduate students) in obtaining professional appointments.

Research

The Promotion and Tenure Committee shall judge scholarship on the basis of evaluations by colleagues within the Department and by peers outside the University who are recognized experts in the candidate's field. For the award of tenure or promotion to Full Professor, reviewers should be outstanding scholars at the rank of Full Professor at well regarded institutions. Ordinarily, only reviewers without personal ties to the candidate should be selected. In making such judgments about the quality of a candidate's research, the Committee shall follow the usual standards for scholarly excellence, including originality, significance to the field, depth and rigor of research, methodological sophistication, accuracy, and quality of writing. It will ask outside reviewers to apply the same criteria.

## Service

Service at all levels shall not be neglected on the grounds that scholarship and teaching have higher priority. All members of the Department are expected to participate in Department meetings and functions and to serve on Department committees. History faculty are expected to devote reasonable amounts of their time to College and University committees and assignments.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee shall base its judgment of service on evidence gathered from the candidate and from the candidate's supervisors or colleagues in the service role. In making this assessment, the Committee shall consider the importance of the assignment, the time required, and the value of the candidate's contribution. Since service assignments vary widely within the Department and the University, the Committee shall identify evidence and assess quality on an individual basis. As a general guideline, service shall generally receive a rating no higher than good. Excellence in service shall normally be reserved for candidates who significantly improve the program or activity assigned to them.

Because the work of program directors and coordinators goes beyond normal service obligations and extends over a longer period, the successful performance of such duties shall greatly strengthen a candidacy in the area of service.

### C. Procedures

1. The Promotion procedures of the History Department shall be posted on the Department's website under "Resources."
2. Assistant Professors on the tenure track will undergo full peer review in the second and fourth contract years. The Faculty Handbook specifies that "reviews of instructors and assistant professors should be conducted with the participation of associate and full professors in the department." [sect. 4.3.5] The peer review committee should provide a clear evaluation of whether the faculty member is making adequate progress towards meeting the Department's criteria for tenure as well as advice about what needs to happen for the criteria to be met. Written reports from peer review committees must be included in the promotion dossier.

3. A faculty member has the right to apply for promotion at any time (subject to the provisions pertaining to tenure described in Section 4.4.3 of the Faculty Handbook) and has the sole right to advance or withdraw the dossier from the promotion process. Faculty members may wish to consult with colleagues, the Chair, or with the Department Executive Committee about the advisability of applying for promotion and about the preparation of a dossier.
4. The promotion process schedule is as follows:

30 April	Candidate must have notified History Chairperson in writing of his/her intention to apply for promotion.
1 May	Candidate must submit his/her complete research file to the departmental Promotion & Tenure Committee and Chair. Candidate must provide a list of names of potential outside reviewers.
15 May	The Promotion & Tenure subcommittee must complete its final list of external reviewers in accordance with procedures outlined in this document and should begin contacting prospective reviewers. A proposed list of external reviewers must be submitted to the Dean's Office before the P&T committee solicits their involvement. The Dean's Office must also approve the solicitation letter. The letter must include the question "How does this candidate compare to top candidates in this field who are at a similar stage in their careers?"
31 May	The Promotion & Tenure subcommittee must have obtained five reviewers willing to participate in promotion reviews and must have sent out research materials to these reviewers.
1 September	Deadline for submission of dossier to the Department Chair and the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee (earlier submission is encouraged).
1 October	Department's recommendation to the Chair.

- 15 October Chair's recommendation to the College Committee and Dean.
- 1 December College Committee's recommendation to the Dean.
- 2 January Dean's recommendation to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee.
- 15 February University Promotions and Tenure Committee recommendations to University Provost.
- 28 February Provost's recommendations.

4. The Department Promotion and Tenure Committee shall consist of the following:
  - a. For candidates for tenured Professor, all tenured Professors who are voting members of the Department.
  - b. For candidates for tenured Associate Professor, all tenured Associate Professors and tenured Professors who are voting members of the Department.
  - c. For candidates for CT Professor, all tenured and CT Professors who are voting members of the Department.
  - d. For candidates for CT Associate Professor, all tenured and CT Professors and Associate Professors who are voting members of the Department.
5. The Promotion and Tenure Committee shall select a chair and secretary and otherwise organize itself.
6. The departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee will create a subcommittee of itself in March to conduct the primary work of a department member's candidacy for promotion and tenure. There will be a subcommittee for each candidate for promotion and tenure, and subcommittees will provide the Promotion and Tenure Committee with draft reports in each area of research, teaching, and service for the Committee's deliberations. Reports of the subcommittees shall be filed in the department office and be made available to all members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee five working days before the meeting at which the final promotion decision will be made.

7. Candidates are encouraged to consult with the members of the subcommittee of the Promotion and Tenure Committee [see below] and the Chair well before the September 1 submission date to facilitate the solicitation of outside peer evaluations in time for consideration by the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee.
8. Each candidate for promotion will be asked to submit a list of possible external referees to the chair of the subcommittee. The subcommittee will submit its own list of possible external referees to the candidate. From these two lists a master list will be assembled by the subcommittee. The candidate will then have the opportunity to challenge potential referees who might not be appropriate. The subcommittee will then obtain letters from five referees on the final list whose identity must not be known to the candidate. The five referees shall be drawn from persons whose professional relationship to the candidate has not included the roles of advisor, advisee, supervisor, employee, employer, co-author, or co-editor. The chair of the subcommittee will forward a copy of the names of external referees to the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee for informational purposes.
9. After examination of the evidence and a free and open discussion among the members of the Promotion & Tenure Committee, the Committee shall vote to endorse or not endorse a candidate. Only the final vote on promotion is to be officially recorded. Other preliminary votes, including those pertaining to a candidate's performance in research, teaching, or service are to be considered only straw polls. If a majority of the Promotion and Tenure Committee endorses the final report of the subcommittee, it will adopt the subcommittee's report as its own and will submit it to the file along with a statement of the Committee's vote. If, however, a majority of the Promotion and Tenure Committee does not endorse the report of the subcommittee, a new majority report must be written by the committee as a whole, or by its representatives. If this occurs, both reports should be submitted in the file. A statement of the composition of the Promotion & Tenure Committee should be attached.
10. The Department Chair shall neither participate in the final deliberations of the Promotion and Tenure Committees nor vote on their recommendations.
11. The Promotion and Tenure Committee's letters shall be communicated to the respective candidates, and to the Department Chair, and be included in the candidates' dossiers.

12. An announcement of the names of those recommended for promotion shall be made at the next regular Department meeting.
13. The recommendations of the Promotion and Tenure Committee shall be forwarded to the Department Chair, who shall review the evidence submitted by the candidates, the reports of the Committee, and the stated criteria for promotion and tenure, and make a recommendation for or against the candidacies. The Chair shall give a written explanation of these decisions to the candidates and to the Promotion and Tenure Committee.
14. A candidate may appeal the decision of the Promotion and Tenure Committee or of the Chair and be granted a hearing by the group or person making the decision. An intention to appeal must be given to the appropriate body within five working days of notification of the decision.
15. If a Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Chair do not support a recommendation for promotion but the candidate chooses not to withdraw, the dossier shall go forward to the College Committee and the Dean, together with the Committee's and the Chair's recommendations.
16. It is the responsibility of the candidate to prepare an organized and cogent dossier, representing the case for promotion as well as possible. The organization of the dossier is described in the University Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion, section 9.
17. Before reaching a final decision, the committee or department chair may solicit additional information from the candidate regarding additional evidence that might clarify the promotion dossier. Any such evidence submitted by the candidate shall be added to the dossier. Such submissions are completely within the discretion of the candidate.

**REVISED** 18 November 2019

**APPROVED BY PROVOST'S OFFICE** 16 November 2021