Submitted: September 2023
Approved by the Dean's Office and Office of the Provost: 09/08/2023

Department of History Criteria for Post Tenure Review

In alignment with University and Board of Governors' regulations 10.003, as well as state law, all tenured faculty members in the Department of History are subjected to post-tenure review every five years. The post tenure review is an evaluation of the previous five years of employment. The review packet, which comprises the material to be reviewed, will be comprised of a narrative record of accomplishments over the previous five years prepared by the faculty member under review, the previous five years of annual performance reviews, the faculty member's CV, and the faculty member's disciplinary record (if there is any).

Department of History guidelines for post-tenure review ensure that the faculty member will be reviewed in relation to nationally recognized standards consistent with the discipline as it exists at research universities. These guidelines are based on quantifiable department criteria for annual evaluation. Post-tenure review will be based on the annual assignments of the faculty member across the five-year period under review.

Rating categories for post-tenure review shall include the following:

1. Exceeds expectations: a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond the average performances of faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit. Performance is appreciably greater than the average college faculty member of the candidate's present rank and field at top-tier research institutions. Must have a sustained and satisfactory professional conduct and performance of academic responsibilities and compliance with state law, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies.
2. Meets expectations: expected level of accomplishment compared to faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit. Sustained record commensurate with the academic standards of a top-tier research institution; evidence of at least a satisfactory performance rating in each annual evaluation during the previous 5 years and satisfactory or greater assessment in each area of assignment; sustained and satisfactory professional conduct and performance of academic responsibilities and compliance with state law, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies.
3. Does not meet expectations: performance falls below the expected range of annual variation in performance compared to faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit but is capable of improvement. A faculty member who has received an overall unsatisfactory annual evaluation during one of the previous five years without evidence of a trajectory of subsequent improvement or exhibited unsatisfactory performance in any single area of assignment over multiple years or pattern of non-compliance with state law, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies may be deemed to not meet expectations.
4. Unsatisfactory: failure to meet expectation that reflects disregard or failure to follow previous advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, or performance that involves incompetence or misconduct as defined in university regulations and policies. A

faculty member who has received an overall unsatisfactory annual evaluation two or more of the previous 5 years or unsatisfactory performance in two or more areas of assignment over three of the last five years of the review period may be deemed unsatisfactory. Demonstrates a consistent pattern of failing to perform duties assigned by the University or sustained violations of applicable state and federal law and applicable published College, University, and Board of Governors regulations, policies, and procedures.

The following criteria for post-tenure review in the Department of History are drawn from university approved criteria for annual evaluations:

Teaching

Post-tenure review of teaching will be based on the previous five years of teaching evaluations and assignment for each year. The post-tenure review evaluation will be provided as one cumulative evaluation of the five-year period. The criteria are as follows:

1. Exceeds expectations: evidence of syllabi that not only meet university guidelines but reflect courses that challenge students intellectually, stimulate their interest, and develop their skills through assessments designed to meet stated goals of the course; high numerical student ratings in all courses and an absence of patterns of criticism or complaints in the written commentary.
2. Meets expectations: evidence of syllabi that not only meet university guidelines but reflect well-organized and well-conceived courses; student ratings that usually meet college average and no discernible patterns of criticism and complaints in written commentary.
3. Does not meet expectations: evidence of syllabi with major lapses in both university guidelines and course design; student ratings consistently below departmental averages and some evidence of patterns of criticism or complaints in written commentary.
4. Unsatisfactory: evidence that the faculty member consistently lacked required elements of teaching portfolio; student ratings significantly below college average with significant patterns of criticism or complaints in written commentary.

Research

Post-tenure review of research will be based on the previous five years of teaching evaluations and assignment for each year. The post-tenure review evaluation will be provided as one cumulative evaluation of the five-year period. The criteria are as follows:

1. Exceeds expectations: Given the variety of forms of research and publication, there are numerous ways to receive this rating. The following are extrapolated from the requirements for annual evaluation:
   a. At least five peer-reviewed articles, book chapters, or digital humanities projects; or
   b. A scholarly book, edited volume, critical edition, textbook, or other book, plus two peer reviewed articles, book chapters, or digital humanities projects; or

c. At least fifteen from the following list:
   i. Acceptance of a manuscript for a forthcoming publication
   ii. Delivery of a scholarly paper
   iii. Presentation of a written commentary at a professional conference
   iv. Publication of a book review or review essay
   v. Posting of juried or invited professional blog or website entry
   vi. Delivery of a professional report
   vii. Editing of a journal or book series
   viii. Publication of a non-peer reviewed article or essay
   ix. Publication of an encyclopedia entry
   x. Small external grants (i.e., travel grants to library or archive)
   xi. Translation of a peer-reviewed essay/article
   xii. A publication or revision of a non-peer reviewed digital humanities project; or
d. An equivalent combination of selections from the above

2. <u>Meets Expectations</u>: Given the variety of forms of research and publication, there are numerous ways to receive this rating. The following are extrapolated from the requirements for annual evaluation:
   a. At least five from the following list:
      i. Acceptance of a manuscript for a forthcoming publication
      ii. Delivery of a scholarly paper
      iii. Presentation of a written commentary at a professional conference
      iv. Publication of a book review or review essay
      v. Posting of juried or invited professional blog or website entry
      vi. Delivery of a professional report
      vii. Editing of a journal or book series
      viii. Publication of a non-peer reviewed article or essay
      ix. Publication of an encyclopedia entry
      x. Small external grants (i.e., travel grants to library or archive)
      xi. Translation of a peer-reviewed essay/article
      xii. A publication or revision of a non-peer reviewed digital humanities project
   b. In addition to five from the above list, faculty should demonstrate evidence of an ongoing significant research project (i.e., scholarly monograph)

3. <u>Does not meet expectations</u>: Less than five from following list and minimal evidence of an ongoing significant research project:
      i. Acceptance of a manuscript for a forthcoming publication
      ii. Delivery of a scholarly paper
      iii. Presentation of a written commentary at a professional conference
      iv. Publication of a book review or review essay
      v. Posting of juried or invited professional blog or website entry
      vi. Delivery of a professional report
      vii. Editing of a journal or book series
      viii. Publication of a non-peer reviewed article or essay
      ix. Publication of an encyclopedia entry
      x. Small external grants (i.e., travel grants to library or archive)
      xi. Translation of a peer-reviewed essay/article

xii.   A publication or revision of a non-peer reviewed digital humanities project
4. <u>Unsatisfactory</u>: No evidence of research or publications over the five-year period under review.

<u>Service</u>

Post-tenure review of service will be based on the previous five years of teaching evaluations and assignment for each year. The post-tenure review evaluation will be provided as one cumulative evaluation of the five-year period. For reference, the following are deemed normal types of service in various categories; however, this list is not exhaustive.

Department
- Executive Council
- Graduate, Undergraduate, Diversity, Awards/Events Committees
- Ad hoc committees
- Tenure/Promotion, Mid-tenure review committees
- Preparation of department external review
- Mentorship

College/University
- SHUM Committees
- CAS Committees
- University Committees
- Faculty Senate
- Informal/ad hoc committees

Profession
- Journal Manuscript review
- Book Manuscript review
- External Review for tenure and promotion
- Letters of Recommendation
- Conference panel organizer
- Conference panel chair
- Officer in professional organization
- Editing journal or book series

Community
- Work with public schools
- Public lecture
- Community engaged work

The criteria are as follows:

1. <u>Exceeds expectations</u>: At least five items of Department service plus 20 other items from the above list
2. <u>Meets expectations</u>: At least five items of Department service plus 10 other items from the above list
3. <u>Does not meet expectations</u>: No departmental service plus at 5 items from the above lists
4. <u>Unsatisfactory</u>: No departmental service and less than 5 items from the above list.

The post-tenure review requires one, holistic evaluation score. This will be the weighted average according to annual assignments based on of the scores in teaching, research, and service.