I. Minimal Criteria for Faculty Tenure and Promotion

The Department shall observe the following criteria for each rank in order to retain highly qualified faculty for the Department of History, Government and International Affairs. When new appointments, recommendations for promotion, and recommendations for tenure fail to meet these minimal criteria, the Department must submit requests for a variance to the appropriate college advisory committee and to the Dean.

A. Minimal Criteria for Associate and Full Professor

1. Associate Professor

   a. Doctoral degree

   b. Evidence of outstanding performance in either teaching or scholarship, at least a strong performance in the other, plus a satisfactory performance in service

   c. Five years in tenure-earning rank, except in cases of unusually compelling merit

   d. Professional visibility beyond the individual’s institution

2. Professor

   a. Doctoral degree

   b. Evidence of outstanding contributions in the area of scholarship and strong performance in the areas of teaching and service

   c. Five years as an associate professor, except in cases of unusually compelling merit

   d. National and/or international professional visibility
B. Tenure Decisions

To qualify for tenure, a faculty member must demonstrate evidence of outstanding performance in either teaching or scholarship, at least a strong performance in the other, plus a satisfactory performance in service. Candidates for tenure will submit to a process of external review of their credentials according to such guidelines for external review as promulgated by the College and campus. When applying for tenure, candidates may submit a review of all information encompassing their performance, assigned or voluntary, during the period under consideration which they believe appropriately supports the application.

C. Promotion Decisions

Advances in rank to associate professor and/or full professor must be based on continuing and consistent scholarship and successful teaching. Articles in draft and/or under consideration, incomplete monographic projects, and unpublished manuscripts do not meet minimum requirements of scholarship for promotion. Candidates for promotion to the ranks of associate professor and full professor will submit to a process of external review of their credentials, according to College and campus guidelines for external review. When applying for promotion, candidates may submit a review of all information encompassing their performance, assigned or voluntary, during the period under consideration which they believe appropriately supports the application.

II. Considerations in Evaluating Teaching Performance

Teaching and teaching-related activities are central to the work of the Department. Superior teaching generally involves knowledge of subjects, concern, commitment, organization of materials, techniques of presentation, etc. In addition, individual teachers may best demonstrate their capabilities in a variety of education settings: large class, small class, seminar, individual contact. Not everyone should be expected to perform with equal competence in all settings. In evaluating teaching, an effort should be made to determine overall teaching effectiveness and contribution of the individual faculty member to the total program.

The following are examples of teaching activities and evidence that might be examined in evaluating a teacher’s performance.
A. Activities to be evaluated

1. Classroom activities
   a. Course objectives and syllabi
   b. Innovative techniques
   c. Evidence of updating course content
   d. Accessibility to students
   e. Overall rigor of the course

2. Directed readings, directed internships, directed field-work, and other individualized courses

3. Activities on thesis or dissertation committees

4. Advising

5. Contributions to the development of curricula and teaching programs

6. Scholarly papers published on teaching in your field

7. Teaching enhancement

B. Methods of Evaluation

1. Student evaluation

2. Evidence of innovative techniques

3. Evidence of updating course content

4. Evidence of accessibility to students

5. Evidence of rigor of the course

6. Evidence of scholarly papers published on teaching in your field

7. Evidence of teaching enhancement

8. Voluntary classroom visits

9. Evaluation of level, size, course load, and variety of courses taught
It is the faculty member’s responsibility to provide information pertinent to the above or any other information deemed relevant to the evaluation of the faculty member’s teaching performance.

III. Considerations in Evaluating Research and Scholarly Activities

In evaluating research and other scholarly activities both quantity and quality should be examined, with quality being the more important consideration. Published and unpublished works, as well as work in progress, should be evaluated. The research time and other research resources provided by the Department and/or College should be taken into account in evaluating each faculty member’s productivity.

In evaluating a faculty member’s research and scholarly productivity, it is expected that documentation be provided for those activities for which the faculty member seeks credit. The following is a list of scholarly activities:

A. Publications

1. Books and monographs (author, co-author, or editor)

2. Articles
   a. Refereed
   b. Non-refereed

3. Chapters in books

4. Review articles

5. Publications in published professional newsletters

6. Audio-visual publications

7. Book reviews

8. Contributions to reference works

B. Participation in Professional Conferences

1. Papers presented at professional meetings, colloquia, seminars, workshops, etc.

2. Serving as discussants or chairpersons on professional panels, workshops, etc.
3. Roundtable, workshop, or poster session participation at professional conferences
4. Participation in professional meetings, conferences, seminars, workshops, etc.

C. Unpublished Materials
   1. Draft manuscripts
   2. Long-term research projects
   3. Audio-visual material prepared for publication

C. Related Scholarly Activities
   1. Grants received
   2. Consultant or research reports
   3. Expert testimony
   4. Media presentations

It is the faculty member’s responsibility to provide information pertinent to the above or any other information deemed relevant to the evaluation of the faculty member’s scholarly performance.

IV. Considerations in Evaluating Service

The term service implies work performed by the faculty member related to the person’s field of interest or the mission of the University for little or no additional compensation. Service includes activities for the Division, College, University, State University System, profession, and general community. Examples of service activities follow:

A. Department
   1. Offices
   2. Committees
   3. Special assignments (advising student organizations, etc.)
B. College
   1. Offices
   2. Committees
   3. Councils
   4. Collaborative work with other divisions
   5. Special assignments (advising student organizations, etc.)

C. University
   1. Offices
   2. Committees
   3. Councils
   4. Senate
   5. Collaborative work with other colleges
   6. Special assignments (advising student organizations, etc.)

D. State University System or Other Universities
   1. Offices
   2. Committees
   3. Councils
   4. Collaborative work with other universities

E. Community
   1. Service to community organizations
   2. Media interviews
3. Talks to civic clubs and other citizen groups

4. Service on local, state, national, or other boards, agencies, and commissions

5. Campus-community collaboration

F. Professional Service

1. Offices and committees of professional organizations

2. Grant and program reviewing

3. Invited lectures

4. Journal editing and service on editorial boards

5. Refereeing book or article manuscripts

It is the faculty member’s responsibility to provide information pertinent to the above or any other information deemed relevant to the evaluation of the faculty member’s service performance.
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