

Department of History

Review, Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Guidelines

Revision approved by department vote, 19 January 2011; revised by department vote, 7 April 2016.
Revision approved by the Office of the Provost December 17, 2020

These guidelines outline the criteria for review, promotion and tenure in the Department of History. They provide a specific departmental context within the general university framework for promotion and tenure of faculty. The guidelines that apply to the candidate's promotion file are generally those in force at the time of hire or at the time of the most recent promotion.

I. Procedures

A. Preamble

This policy applies to all represented faculty and is intended to comply with all provisions of Article 20 of the CBA. In the event of any discrepancies or inconsistencies, the CBA language applies for represented faculty. This policy also applies to all unrepresented faculty, unless a university-wide policy exists that contradicts the terms of this policy.

This policy is focused primarily on the criteria by which faculty are evaluated. Detailed descriptions of the processes by which reviews are conducted are presented in Article 20 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement and in relevant UO policies for unrepresented faculty. Procedures specific to the Department of History are presented below. This document will be made available in the department or unit (as well as on the Office of the Provost website).

B. Annual Reviews

Each Assistant Professor will be reviewed annually by the Department Head. These annual reviews provide an opportunity to evaluate whether the faculty member is progressing towards a favorable tenure decision and offer an opportunity to address any problems in a timely fashion. The annual reviews are written by the Department Head and are forwarded to the College. The review is based on the candidate's annual report, which should include the following: (1) a CV, lists of publications and grants, and lists (by year and term) of their courses and committees to date; (2) a narrative description of the candidate's progress during the past year in research, teaching, and service (a brief paragraph for each area will suffice); and (3) a brief description of goals and plans for next year and beyond.

C. Contract Renewal/Third-Year Review

In the middle of the tenure and promotion period, typically in the third year for faculty members who do not have prior credit towards tenure, the faculty member will undergo a

contract renewal. The contract renewal is a thorough review that involves a departmental personnel committee report, a departmental vote, a review by the Department Head, and approval by the Dean. A fully satisfactory review indicating that the faculty member is on track towards promotion and tenure will lead to a contract extension up through the tenure and promotion year. If the contract renewal process determines that the faculty member's record is not satisfactory and that promotion and tenure are not likely, the faculty member will be given a one-year, terminal contract. A faculty member may also be given a renewable contract that does not extend to the promotion and tenure year if there are questions as to whether the faculty member will have a record meriting promotion at the end of the tenure and promotion period. In such cases, the faculty member will be required to go through another contract renewal process prior to the promotion and tenure review in order to determine if the faculty member has been able to remedy the shortcomings in the record identified in the contract renewal process.

D. Review for Promotion and Tenure

i. External Reviewers

In the spring term prior to the year when the tenure case is to be considered, the Department Head will consult with members of the department and, when appropriate, members of any research institute/center with which the faculty member is affiliated, and prepare a list of external referees who will be invited to evaluate the research record of the candidate. Subsequently, the candidate will be asked to submit a list of potential external referees to the Department Head. These processes must be independent. External reviewers should generally be from comparable or more highly regarded institutions. Ideally, they should be full Professors who have the appropriate expertise to evaluate the candidate's record. Dissertation advisors, close personal friends, or other individuals who might be viewed as having a conflict of interest, are not asked to be external reviewers.

ii. Internal Reviewers

The department may also solicit on-campus letters from those familiar with the candidate's teaching, scholarship or service. In particular, inclusion of an internal review is the norm when a faculty member is a member of a research institute/center. This review is prepared by the Director of the institute/center, in consultation with its senior members.

iii. Promotion and Tenure Committee and Report

During the spring term, and prior to the deadline by which the tenure case must be submitted, the Department Head will appoint a promotion and tenure committee of tenured faculty to review the candidate. If there is an insufficient number of tenured faculty in the department to constitute a personnel committee, the Department Head should select committee members from tenured faculty in other related departments with guidance from the Dean and the appropriate Associate Dean. This committee will be charged with submitting a written report to the department evaluating the candidate's case for promotion. In particular, the committee report will include an internal assessment of the candidate's work, a summary and evaluation of the external and internal referees'

assessment of the candidate's work, an evaluation of teaching that includes a discussion of the numerical student evaluation scores if applicable, information from student experience surveys, written comments, and peer reviews, and an assessment of department, university, professional, and community service. The committee report must conclude with a recommendation to the department regarding tenure and promotion. The committee report is generally made available in the department office to all tenured faculty of appropriate rank for review prior to the department meeting. In most departments, both Associate and full Professors vote in tenure and promotion cases, but only full Professors vote for promotion from Associate to full Professor.

iv. Department Meeting and Vote

In general, the Department will hold a meeting in mid- to late October to consider its promotion and tenure recommendation for the candidate. Voting members meet and discuss the committee report and the case. Following discussion, members vote by signed, secret ballot on whether to recommend tenure and promotion (or just promotion in the case of a promotion to full Professor). When all votes have been registered, the votes will be tallied, usually by the Department Head, and the department will be informed of the final vote tally. The anonymity of the individual votes will be maintained, although the signed ballots will be kept in a signed and sealed envelope by the Department Head in case they are requested by the Dean or the Provost. The Department Head does not vote.

v. Department Head's Review

After the department vote, the Department Head writes a separate statement. The statement includes a description of the process, including any unique characteristics of the profession (e.g., books versus articles; extent of co-authorship; significance of order of names on publications, etc.). The statement also offers an opinion regarding the case for promotion and tenure that may or may not agree with the department vote. The Department Head's statement, the personnel committee report, the recorded vote, and the materials submitted by the candidate are added to the dossier. The completed file is then sent to the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS). The deadline for submission of the file to CAS is November 1.

II. Guidelines

The History Department values excellence in both scholarship and teaching. Excellence in one dimension alone will not be sufficient to guarantee tenure or promotion. The tenure process is long and complicated. However, the History Department's policy is to hire people whom we expect to be strong candidates for tenure and promotion and provide them an environment conducive to the accomplishments we expect of them. This statement represents the standards and expectations of the History Department. Since the tenure and promotion process also involves the College of Arts and Sciences and Provost's Office and their respective committees, candidates should familiarize themselves with relevant

statements of College and University policy, including the “Guide to Promotion and Tenure at the University of Oregon,” available on the web at: <https://provost.uoregon.edu/ttf-promotion-tenure>.

In its evaluation of candidates for tenure, the Department of History generally weighs the criteria for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with indefinite tenure according to the following distribution: Scholarship, 60%; Teaching, 30%; and Service, 10%. In evaluating candidates for promotion from Associate Professor to the rank of full Professor, the department places greater emphasis on service at all levels, according to the following general distribution: Scholarship, 50%; Teaching, 30%; and Service, 20%.

A. Scholarship

Since History is an AAU doctoral research department, committees give special attention to the activities and achievements of the candidate as a scholar. Normally, excellence in research is measured by the candidate’s publication record. The candidate’s personal statement should describe the development, future direction, and significance of a coherent scholarly program. In general, the History Department expects a candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor to have either a published book or a completed manuscript that has been accepted for publication by a reputable press. Candidates for promotion should understand that the Office of the Provost requires that a book manuscript be “in production” in order for it to count towards promotion. “In production” means that all work on the manuscript by the author, including all revisions, must be complete. This requirement represents the normal standard for promotion in History.

In particular cases, the department may find it appropriate to set an equivalent to this standard that takes a different form. For example, individual scholarly profiles may lead to a pattern of publishing substantial articles rather than books. In other cases, in subfields of the discipline where the publication of scholarly articles is the prevalent and accepted practice, a number of substantial articles may fulfill this requirement. While there is no set rule for the number of articles someone pursuing this course should have in print or forthcoming, it is unlikely that fewer than six to eight would be viewed as a scholarly equivalent to a book in print or accepted for publication. Generally, books and articles should appear in highly regarded and peer-reviewed outlets. The Office of the Provost requires that articles and book chapters must either be “in print” or “forthcoming” in order to count towards a faculty member’s publications. “Forthcoming” means that an article or book chapter has been accepted for publication and requires no further revisions other than copy-editing. A letter to this effect from a journal editor or editor of a volume of essays for each “forthcoming” publication is recommended.

Generally, in order for publications to be counted fully toward promotion, it is expected that books should be “in production” and that each listed article or book chapter should be “forthcoming” by the time the candidate meets with the Dean.

Electronic publication may be an appropriate form for historical scholarship, but candidates should take care that their publication venues follow the same criteria of peer review and evaluation as traditional academic books and journals. Electronic publication is an emerging and rapidly changing area and will therefore require periodic re-examination for its impact on tenure and promotion standards. Candidates can expect electronic publications to be included in tenure and promotion reviews so long as the venues and evaluation procedures follow the same criteria as traditional publications such as journal articles and books. (Electronic work that appears in e-journals, for example, may already have undergone conventional peer review, whereas electronic work that appears in the form of an independent website may not.) The following guidelines are particularly relevant for the review of scholarship in digital forms:

1. Peer Review: As with all scholarship, peer review is crucial. We expect reviewers of electronic publication to review those publications in the medium for which they were produced. (For example, web-based projects should be examined online rather than in printed form.) We expect reviewers to systematically compare that work with other scholarship in the field in order to assess its originality and creativity, just as we would expect for traditional publications. Because digital history is still quite new, however, special care should be devoted to the selection of appropriate reviewers. Appropriate reviewers will be knowledgeable about the range and current direction of electronic publications, as well as traditional publications, in whatever field is under consideration.
2. Permanence: Reviews of electronic publications should offer information about the visibility and durability of the venue in which electronic scholarship appears.
3. Candidates for tenure and promotion may, at their discretion, submit a brief, written explanation of how their electronic work compares to traditional scholarship in their field.

In any case, publications must make significant contributions to scholarship in the judgment of outside referees in the candidate's field (see "Procedures," below) and of tenured faculty in the department. Thus, quality counts as well as quantity. Indications of scholarly productivity beyond the initial book or portfolio of articles are important. Candidates should at least be prepared to discuss their ongoing research projects and future plans.

For promotion from associate to full professor, the department expects the candidate to have either a second published book or a second completed manuscript accepted for publication by a reputable press, or the equivalent as described in the preceding paragraphs. Again, quality counts as well as quantity.

The expectation for scholarship for the sixth-year post-promotion review at the level of full professor is substantial, ongoing research and publication that is demonstrated by evidence submitted to the department and reviewed by the committee. Submitted material

might include a monograph, chapters or articles in peer-reviewed publications, professional papers, evidence of research grants, etc.

All faculty undergoing the sixth-year post-promotion review at the level of full professor are expected, at the start of the review process, to provide manuscripts or chapter drafts of books-in-progress, together with submitted articles under review, if their already-published work may not already clearly meet or exceed the expectations stipulated above. In assessing unpublished material, committees should review all such submitted scholarship. Reports should precisely characterize the state of material included in the review file in terms of substance and closeness to completion.

Other factors may contribute to demonstrating excellence in research. They include professional standing and impact on the scholarly field, as demonstrated by the evaluations of external reviewers, awards, membership on boards of journals and professional organizations, and the like; external grant funding; conference attendance and presentations; and other activities that are signs of professional regard, including editorial activities and providing promotion reviews for other institutions. None of these individual elements is required, nor is any particular constellation of them, but any or all may contribute to demonstrating an individual's pattern of scholarly excellence.

B. Teaching

The Department of History values excellence in teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Moreover, the department expects in most cases that tenured (and in many cases untenured) faculty will share department responsibilities for large introductory courses as well as more specialized, upper-division classes. In assessing teaching quality, the department relies on a variety of sources, including summary data from student experience surveys, comments from student experience surveys, and classroom visits by colleagues before and during the process of consideration for tenure and/or promotion. If the review period includes teaching prior to Fall 2019, numerical scores from student course evaluations may be included but cannot be used as the sole standard for assessing teaching quality. The Office of the Provost requires that assistant professors have at least one course evaluated by a faculty peer visit during each of the three years preceding their promotion and tenure review. UO Senate legislation, as well as the Office of the Provost, requires tenured faculty members with the rank of associate professor to have at least one course evaluated by a faculty peer every other year until promotion to full professor. It is the department's responsibility to arrange these peer teaching evaluations. The department expects that faculty at all ranks will bear an appropriate share of responsibility for supervising undergraduate theses and serving on graduate student exam and dissertation committees. Meritorious service in these capacities may be considered part of a pattern of excellence in teaching.

Evaluation of teaching will be assessed using the university standards described in the August 2019 MOU between the University and United Academics.

Documentation of activities is important: candidates should keep copies of syllabi and other course materials used. Teaching materials developed in electronic form should also be included in the teaching file and, whenever possible, should be evaluated in the medium for which they were produced. The University's Faculty Handbook recommends that candidates for promotion and tenure "submit a teaching vita representing a comprehensive record of their teaching activities as well as a teaching portfolio that illustrates teaching scholarship and instructional effectiveness."

Untenured faculty must bear in mind that even impressive dedication and excellence in teaching alone is no substitute for developing a successful program of scholarly research and publication.

C. Service

1. Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor: The department expects its untenured members to participate responsibly and cooperatively when called upon for service within the department. But service counts significantly less in consideration for tenure than either teaching or scholarship. Although untenured faculty members may find it appropriate to serve on one or another college- or university-wide committee, they should undertake such duties only on a very limited basis if at all. The department will not penalize any untenured faculty member for declining to serve on committees outside the department. Service to the profession is also evaluated favorably, but in this case as well, service counts significantly less in consideration for tenure than either teaching or scholarship.

2. Promotion from Associate to Full Professor: In the case of promotion from associate to full professor, service is weighted more heavily. The candidate should normally have made important contributions to the department, college and university. Significant service to the profession will also be evaluated favorably as an indication that the faculty member has the esteem of their professional peers. The relative weight accorded to these two kinds of service will vary from case to case. Community service in one's capacity as a historian may also be taken into account.

The Collective Bargaining Agreement states that candidates' statements "should also include discussion of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion" (Article 20, Section 12).

III. Post-tenure Review

A. Third-Year Post-Tenure Review

Primary responsibility for the third-year PTR process lies with the department head. The third-year PTR should be commenced by the department head no later than during the Winter term, in order to allow it to be concluded before the end of the candidate's third-year post-tenure. The department head will contact the faculty member and request a CV and personal statement, including a discussion of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion. The department head will add to the evaluative file copies of the faculty

member's teaching evaluations received during the period under review, including quantitative summary sheets and signed written evaluations, as well as any peer evaluations of teaching conducted during the review period. Consistent with department policy and practice, the file will be reviewed first by a committee, which will provide a written report to the department head that may be used as received or placed in additional written context by the department head. For associate professors, the report will specifically present an honest appraisal of progress toward a successful review for promotion to full professor. If the faculty member has undergone an earlier sixth-year PTR that resulted in creation of a development plan due to unsatisfactory performance (see discussion of sixth-year PTR, below), the faculty member's success in addressing concerns will be discussed. The report will be signed and dated by the department head and shared with the faculty member, who will also sign and date the report to signify its receipt. The faculty member may provide a written response if they desire within 10 days of receipt of the PTR report; an extension may be granted by mutual agreement between the faculty member and the department head. The report and, if provided, response from the faculty member, will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file as maintained at the unit level.

B. Sixth-Year Post-Tenure Review

The process of the review is described in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, Article 20, or in parallel University policy for unrepresented faculty members. Since the sixth-year PTR is expected to be a deeper review of the faculty member's scholarship, teaching, and service, the Department of History expects the candidate to provide a portfolio of publications (or documentation of other scholarship activities) and information regarding service contributions, in addition to the materials called for by CBA/UO policy.

A development plan is required for faculty who are not achieving a satisfactory level of performance. The plan will be developed with appropriate consultation and discussion among the faculty member, the department head, and the dean. Ideally, there will be consensus regarding the development plan, but if consensus is not possible, a plan receiving the dean's approval will be forwarded to the Provost or designee for review and approval.

If a sixth-year PTR results in creation of a professional development plan, future PTR for the faculty member will include consideration of the extent to which the terms of the development plan have been met. However, progress toward meeting the goals of such a development plan need not and should not be evaluated solely within the context of the PTR process.