8 January, 2014

**To:** Matthew Garcia

**From:** SHPRS Personnel Committee

**Re:**  Revised Policies and Procedures for Personnel Actions in SHPRS

It is our understanding that these policies and procedures are to be reviewed by the school executive committee and Dean Deborah Clarke, and submitted to the faculty of the school for approval.

**Promotion and Tenure**

Promotion and tenure reviews to the rank of associate and full professor shall be carried out by the relevant disciplinary personnel committee (or, in the case of History, the elected presentation committee followed by consideration of the committee of the whole at or above the rank of the candidate) and forwarded by the chair of the disciplinary personnel committee to the chair of the SHPRS Personnel Committee. After considering the candidate’s file, the letter of the relevant disciplinary committee, and the criteria for promotion and tenure in that discipline, the SHPRS Personnel Committee shall write a letter of evaluation. This letter is to be addressed to the CLAS Deans and sent to the school Director. It becomes a part of the tenure and/or promotion file to be forwarded through the various stages of review.

All nine members of the SHPRS Personnel Committee shall review the files of candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and sign the committee’s letter. Only the full professors shall review and sign off on letters evaluating applications for promotion to full Professor. Votes of the relevant disciplinary personnel committee and the SHPRS Personnel Committee will be recorded in the final letter of evaluation.

Lists of external reviewers for promotion and tenure cases shall be drawn up by the school Director in consultation with the SHPRS Personnel Committee and the candidate (who will have the opportunity to submit a list of potential reviewers), relying especially upon the expertise of the members of the Personnel Committee elected by the relevant faculty.

**Probationary Review of Assistant Professors**

Probationary Reviews shall be carried out by the relevant elected disciplinary personnel committee and forwarded by its chair to the Chair of the SHPRS Personnel Committee. After considering the candidate’s file, the letter of the respective disciplinary committee, and the criteria for probationary reviews in that discipline, the SHPRS Personnel Committee shall write an advisory letter to the Director.

**Progress-toward-Tenure Letters (for Assistant and Associate Professors without tenure)**

The elected Chair of the personnel committee in the candidate’s discipline shall meet with the candidate, review the candidate’s work to date, and prepare a letter evaluating the candidate’s progress toward tenure. The letter shall be submitted to the school Director, with a copy to the Chair of the SHPRS Personnel Committee.

**Mentoring of Tenure-track Assistant Professors**

The Director shall assign each Assistant Professor a faculty mentor in consultation with the disciplinary personnel committee. The Director shall inform the chair of the SHPRS Personnel Committee about the choice of mentor.

**Lecturer Reviews and Promotion Applications**

Reviews of lecturers and their applications for promotion to Senior Lecturer or Principal Lecturer shall be carried out by the relevant elected disciplinary personnel committee and forwarded by its chair to the Chair of the SHPRS Personnel Committee. After considering the candidate’s file, the letter of the respective disciplinary committee, and the criteria for lecturers in that discipline, the SHPRS Personnel Committee shall write a letter of evaluation and submit it to the Director.

**Sabbatical** **Applications**

Sabbatical reviews shall be conducted by the elected personnel committee in the relevant discipline. That committee’s recommendation, including a brief evaluatory statement, shall be forwarded to the Director through the Chair of the SHPRS Personnel Committee.

**Annual Performance Reviews**

The SHPRS Personnel Committee shall prepare a report to the Director using a 3-point scale. In accord with ACD 506.10 (<http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd506-10.html>),the review shall cover the past three years’ Faculty Activity Reports, “with substantial emphasis” on the immediately past year. The criteria in the following paragraphs presume a standard 40/40/20 workload assignment; proportionate adjustments in the criteria will be made for faculty with different workload assignments. The Director shall maintain complete confidentiality with respect to the Personnel Committee’s review of faculty members.

Teaching and service shall be reviewed using standardized cross-SHPRS standards in order to create equitable assessments. For this purpose, the FARs to be reviewed will be divided among Personnel Committee members. Each member will provide an assessment using the criteria will flag any difficult cases. The entire committee will review the assessments, checking the accuracy of the report against the FAR, and asking any questions, especially where the numbers are at the low or high end. Special attention will be given to any 1s at this meeting.

**Criteria – Teaching:**

1 – Unsatisfactory

The faculty member fails to meet reasonable expectations with respect to one or more of the following: (1) teaching evaluations, (2) evidence of commitment to student success (3) the number of students being taught, mentored, and/or supervised.

2 – Satisfactory

The faculty member meets reasonable expectations with respect to all of the following but does not significantly exceed reasonable expectations with respect to any of the following: (1) teaching evaluations, (2) evidence of commitment to student success, and (3) the number of students being taught, mentored, and/or supervised.

3 – Outstanding

The faculty member meets reasonable expectations with respect to all of the following and significantly exceeds reasonable expectations with respect to at least one of the following: (1) teaching evaluations, (2) evidence of commitment to student success and (3) the number of students being taught, mentored, and/or supervised.

**Criteria – Service (for Associate Professors and full Professors):**

1 – Unsatisfactory

The faculty member has no or insignificant service.

2 – Satisfactory

The faculty member has performed minimal or moderate amounts of service to the disciplinary faculty, the School of Historical, Philosophical and Religious Studies, the College and University, and or the profession outside of ASU.

3 – Outstanding

The faculty member has served on up to 3 committees or in one or two positions involving a significant workload in the disciplinary faculty, the School of Historical, Philosophical and Religious Studies, the College and University, and or the profession outside of ASU.

**Criteria – Service (for Assistant Professors)**

2 – Satisfactory

The faculty member has performed minimal or moderate amounts of service to the disciplinary faculty, the School of Historical, Philosophical and Religious Studies, the College and University, and or the profession outside of ASU.

3 – Outstanding

The faculty member has served meritoriously in at least two significant roles in the disciplinary faculty, the School of Historical, Philosophical and Religious Studies, the College and University, and or the profession outside of ASU.

Sample table:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Name | Committees  | Positions held |
|  |  |  |

Research criteria will be established within each discipline. For the purpose of reviewing research, Personnel Committee members will divide into 3 disciplinary subcommittees and review the FARs according to their disciplinary criteria. If the members of a disciplinary subcommittee reports to the Chair of the SHPRS PC that they need additional help to review the research part of the FARs, the Chair of the Personnel Committee shall ask the relevant faculty head to hold an election among the faculty of that discipline to elect one to three additional members of the disciplinary subcommittee to assist with this specific task only. When the entire Personnel Committee meets, the disciplinary subcommittees (excluding any extra members elected to assist with the research component of the review) will be expected to defend any scores of 1. All Personnel Committee members will have a chance to review the research assessments and ask questions.

It should be noted that according to ACD 507-09 (<http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd507-09.html>), an Unsatisfactory rating in one category triggers a Unit Development Plan; an Unsatisfactory rating in two categories, or failure to meet a previously set Unit Development Plan, generates a Performance Improvement Plan. The faculty member must appeal within 30 days. These consequences shall be brought to the attention of all faculty in the memo sent out requesting faculty to fill in their Faculty Activity Reports.

**Appendix I. History Faculty Criteria for Promotion and Tenure**

The Faculty of History is committed to maintaining and enhancing its distinction in scholarship, teaching, and service. The Faculty’s mission is to promote the advancement and dissemination of knowledge for the educational benefit of students and faculty at Arizona State University and for a national and international audience of teachers, scholars, and students in the discipline of history. The History Faculty recognizes that scholarship and teaching are closely intertwined and considers excellence in these areas to be in accord with a faculty member’s service to the college, the university, and the community. The Faculty expects that each of its members will be productive in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service, albeit perhaps more so in one of these areas than in another at different times.

Aspiring to excellence, the History Faculty also recognizes that the measurements of excellence are difficult to ascertain in the discipline of history, given its remarkable diversity. The discipline is no longer a unified academic field, but a cluster of many sub-fields, each with its own distinctive methodology. Because the Faculty is composed of scholars with very different training and research agendas, the Faculty has very detailed assessment procedures for promotion and tenure that assure candidates will be adequately evaluated by specialists in their respective fields.

**A. Promotion to Associate Professor (with Tenure)**

Each candidate for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure will be judged in three categories: Research, Teaching, and Service. To be recommended for tenure, the candidate must present an overall record of excellence in research and teaching and provide evidence of satisfactory achievement in service.

1. **Research**

a. Promotion to this rank requires that the candidate furnish a body of work judged meritorious by the History Faculty and by other historians outside the university. The principal criterion for promotion to Associate Professor (with tenure) is a demonstrated ability to do original, independent research of high quality, resulting in appropriate publications that make a significant scholarly contribution. Ordinarily this will include the production of at least one scholarly, book-length monograph. At the time of consideration for promotion this book should either be published or in production. In addition to the book-length monograph, the candidate should have at least two peer-reviewed articles in refereed journals and other scholarly published work. The term “monograph” as used here is defined as original scholarship based on primary sources that carries forward an argument and makes a significant contribution to the field. Textbooks and synthetic books do not qualify for promotion in lieu of a monograph. Synthetic works, textbooks, encyclopedia articles, entries in historical dictionaries, and book reviews, each provide additional evidence of professional visibility and demonstrate a high recognition in the field. The candidate must also provide an overview of a continuing research agenda, including evidence of progress made to date.

b. Public historians should publish a book with an appropriate publisher. The book may be related to public historical work or it may be a scholarly monograph on a topic that relates to public history. The evidence of excellence in this field is also to be demonstrated in the publication of at least three refereed articles/book chapters in the field of public history, or in equivalent publications or works in public history.

c. For all historians, digital publications may make up part of a person’s professional scholarly accomplishment in the same categories as similar works in print. For original digital projects that go beyond the genres of work traditionally employed by historians for presentation of original research, (e.g. data bases, annotated critical editions or primary documents, permanent resources for scholars) the candidate will document the peer review process and provide evidence (usually in the form of user data) of the impact of the project on the wider world of scholarship.

2. **Teaching**

a. In a public university the ability to educate undergraduates is crucial to the mission of the university. A candidate for promotion to Associate Professor must demonstrate good teaching skills and rapport with undergraduate students. The assessment of the candidate’s teaching ability will be drawn from no fewer than six reports gathered during the probationary period from the History Faculty’s tenured members as well as student evaluations. Student evaluations of teaching and other appropriate measurements must be at least within History Faculty norms. Candidates are expected to play an active role in undergraduate education and to be involved with introductory survey level courses. Candidates might not immediately become involved in the graduate program but should become active participants (as opportunities present themselves) by the time of review.

b. Public historians will primarily but not exclusively teach graduate students and must be able to develop class projects and to arrange individual internships. In addition they will be evaluated on their ability to recruit and advise students, place and monitor interns, and administrate the Public History Program.

3. **Service**:

Assistant Professors need have only limited involvement in committee work on the History Faculty, school, collegial, and university levels. Participation in appropriate professional organizations is strongly encouraged. The same applies to public historians whose contribution to the profession will be evaluated on the basis of active involvement with appropriate public organizations.

**B. Promotion to Full Professor**

Each candidate for promotion to Full Professor will be judged in three categories: Research, Teaching, and Service. To be recommended for promotion, the candidate must present an overall record of excellence in research and teaching and provide evidence of significant professional service.

1. **Research**

a. A candidate for Full Professor must demonstrate national and international recognition for scholarship and leadership in his/her field and a significant contribution to historical scholarship. Ordinarily the requirements for promotion to Full Professor will include a second monograph published since tenure (see above for the definition of “monograph” in this document) and at least five additional publications since tenure. These include refereed articles, guest-edited journal issues, book chapters, edited volumes, or a synthetic book. At least three of these publications should be peer reviewed in refereed journals in the field. Textbooks, encyclopedia articles, entries in historical dictionaries, and book reviews, each provide additional evidence of professional recognition and demonstrate a scholar’s standing in the field. Grants, fellowships, and contracts are further indicators of national reputation. The candidate must also present a clear research agenda for the next five years, providing evidence of progress to date.

b. Public historians should publish a book with an appropriate publisher. The book may be related to public historical work or it may be a scholarly monograph on a topic that impinges on public history. The evidence of excellence in this field is also to be demonstrated in the publication of at least three refereed articles/book chapters in the field of public history, or in equivalent publications or works in public history.

c. For all historians, digital publications may make up part of a person’s professional scholarly accomplishment in the same categories as similar works in print. For original digital projects that go beyond the genres of work traditionally employed by historians for presentation of original research, (e.g. data bases, annotated critical editions or primary documents, permanent resources for scholars) the candidate will document the peer review process and provide evidence (usually in the form of user data) of the impact of the project on the wider world of scholarship.

2. **Teaching**

a. A candidate for promotion to Professor must demonstrate continuing excellence in teaching at both the graduate and undergraduate levels and is expected to participate in the training of graduate students, broadly defined, as opportunities present themselves. The candidate’s statement of teaching philosophy and practice should emphasize the development of the candidate’s teaching since being awarded tenure and address an agenda for future development.

b. Public historians will also be evaluated on their ability to recruit and advise students, place and monitor interns, and administer the Public History Program.

3. **Service**

Candidates for Professor should play a significant role on faculty, school, college, and university committees. Candidates should provide evidence of significant participation and leadership in professional organizations at regional and national levels. Candidates for Professor should have a record of public service on local, national, or international levels that reaches beyond Arizona State University and professional organizations.

**Appendix II. Philosophy Faculty Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion**

**Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor**

Each candidate for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure will be judged in three categories, Research, Teaching, and Service, proportional to their workload assignments. To be recommended for tenure and promotion, the candidate must present an overall record of excellence in research and teaching and provide evidence of satisfactory achievement in service.

**Research**

Candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor should show real promise of becoming leading scholars and researchers.

Quality of publications is the central criterion for tenure and promotion to associate professor. Among the factors used in assessing the quality of a candidate’s publications are: originality and significance of the project, stature and selectiveness of the publishing venue, appearance in a refereed venue, and impact of the work nationally and internationally. External referees’ assessment of the quality of the work also plays a significant role in the review committee’s deliberations.

Because quality of publications is the central criterion, there is no set number of publications that is necessary or sufficient for a positive assessment of the candidate’s research. The national norm for quantity of publications is significantly lower in the discipline of philosophy than for other humanities disciplines. (Other humanities disciplines might expect 8 to 12 articles and/or a book). This may reflect the difficulty of constructing the kinds of closely argued essays that can make it into journals that have a 5-15% acceptance rate. Tenure candidates in philosophy would be well advised to aim for at least six publications with the majority published after their employment at ASU. Candidates are also encouraged to measure their performance against successful tenure cases in their research areas at peer institutions.

It is important that some of the publications be accepted in first class, peer-reviewed journals in the candidate’s field of research. Articles published electronically are assessed by the same standards as printed publications. Chapters or substantial introductions contributed to anthologies are evaluated on the basis of the quality of the work itself, the quality and importance of the volume, whether the contribution was refereed, and the extent to which, if invited, the invitation is an indication of the candidate’s authoritative stature in the field. In exceptional cases, encyclopedia entries, such as to the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, may be treated as equivalent to a journal article. Candidates are advised to seek the Personnel Committee’s advice on publishing venues and types of publication.

Monograph publication is not the norm in philosophy for candidates coming up for tenure and promotion to associate review. Candidates who do have a monograph publication would be well advised to also have some articles in refereed venues. It is important that the monograph be published by a well-respected university or academic press. Edited anthologies, translations with a critical introduction and/or scholarly annotations, and edited special issues of journals contribute to one’s research portfolio, but they do not count as much as original research and writing. Tenure candidates should thus think carefully about where to invest their research energies. Monographs or edited collections that appear designed for classroom use and to compete in the textbook market are standardly given less weight by external referees and by the review committee in philosophy.

Co-authored articles or books will be assessed by the same standards as single authored articles and books. The candidate should indicate the proportion of their contribution to a co-authored publication. The candidate will receive credit in proportion to the contribution to the co-authored work.

A manuscript must be complete and accepted by a publisher and “in production” in order to count towards promotion and tenure as a publication. “In production” indicates the completion of all work on the manuscript by the author, including all revisions, with the exception of editing associated with production (such as copyediting, page proofs, and indexing). Similarly, articles and book chapters must either be “in print” or “forthcoming” in order to be counted as publications. ”Forthcoming” means that an article or book chapter has been accepted for publication and requires no further authorial revisions or editing, with the exception of editing associated with production (such as copyediting and page proofs). College and University review committees strongly favor page proofs as evidence of completion. However, given the length of time manuscripts may spend in the review process and/or in the publication queue after final acceptance (which may be more than a year), page proofs may not be available. If page proofs are not yet available, candidates should provide a letter of final acceptance from the journal or press.

Work in progress and work submitted but still under review will be considered as evidence of a sustained research trajectory.

Tenure and promotion candidates are expected to have been active in presenting their work in local and national venues, if not also international ones. Candidates are thus advised to submit their work for conference presentations and should indicate whether conference contributions are refereed or not. Invited lectures provide evidence that the candidate’s work is recognized within the larger profession of philosophy.

Although it is advisable for candidates to focus their research energies on scholarly production, manuscript reviewing for respected journals, presses, and conferences and invited book reviews are evidence of public recognition of the candidate’s standing in his or her field of research.

External funding is rare in philosophy, and receipt of either external or internal awards grants weights in the candidate's favor while its absence is not a negative.

**Teaching**

Candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor should be strong teachers, active in mentoring students and in contributing to the quality of the undergraduate and graduate curriculum. Quality of teaching is judged primarily by student evaluations of teaching and peer evaluations by faculty. One peer evaluation will be conducted before the 3rd year review. Two additional peer evaluations—one of a lower division course and one of an upper division or graduate course--will be conducted before the tenure review. Nomination or receipt of teaching awards, curricular development, innovation in teaching strategies are all positive indicators of quality teaching. Evidence of mentoring includes serving on or chairing thesis committees, overseeing internships and independent study projects, advising student groups at either the undergraduate or graduate level, involvement of students in the candidate’s research projects. Pre-tenure faculty are not expected to chair graduate thesis committees. All faculty members are expected to participate in the full range of courses, including a share each semester of service courses.

**Service**

Candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor are expected to have done regular service for the philosophy faculty. Service at school, college, and university levels counts in the candidate’s favor. Given the importance of establishing a publication record and of developing one’s teaching during the pre-tenure period, the expectations for service contributions are lower than for tenured faculty.

**Promotion to Full Professor**

**Research**

Candidates for promotion to full professor are expected to have established a national and international reputation in their field(s) of research. Reputational evidence includes citations to the candidate’s work, invited colloquia or conference presentations, invited keynote lectures, service in editorial positions (e.g., editor, editorial board, book review editor) for journals and book series, elected office in professional philosophical associations, journal and book manuscript reviewing, and external tenure and promotion reviews.

Candidates are expected to have a sustained record of scholarly activity, with publications continuing to appear on a regular basis since the previous promotion. Assessment of the quality of publications and the weight attached to different sorts of scholarly activities will be according to the same standards as for tenure and promotion to associate professor.

Because quality of publications and national and international reputation are the central criteria, there is no set number of publications that is sufficient for a positive assessment of the candidate’s research. That said, candidates for promotion to full professor would be well advised to have a monograph published after the last promotion with a respected university or academic press. At least some of the candidate’s published work should be considered leading contributions to the candidate’s field of research.

**Teaching**

Quality of teaching will be assessed by the same measures as for tenure and promotion to associate professor. In addition, candidates for promotion to full professor are expected to be significantly involved in graduate education, especially in the form of chairing and serving on graduate thesis committees.

**Service**

Candidates for promotion to full professor are expected to have accepted significant internal service on philosophy faculty, school, college, and/or university committees and to be active in some external professional service roles. The latter include conference organizing, editorial-related roles for journals and book presses, office in a professional philosophical organization, external tenure and promotion reviews, and manuscript reviewing.

**Appendix III. Religious Studies Criteria for Promotion and Tenure**

**TENURE AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR**

The Faculty of Religious Studies regards as necessary the four criteria listed in the ACD Manual (506-7). A candidate for tenure must present sufficient evidence of having made, and of the potential of continuing to make, a contribution in the areas of quality scholarship, effective teaching, and service to the profession, the University, and the wider community.

The Faculty of Religious Studies comprises a variety of fields of scholarship in religious studies, ranging from those that focus on textual and historical scholarship, to contextual and interpretive kinds of work, to reflective and constructive analyses of religious thought and behavior. Because of this variety no single profile for tenure and promotion can be drawn. The following narrative identifies the general parameters which guide decisions on tenure and promotion in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service.

1. **Scholarship**. Although not the only criterion in decisions concerning tenure and promotion, scholarly contribution to the field is indispensable in judging such cases. Outstanding scholarship carries positive weight in tenure and promotion decisions, but not to the exclusion of teaching effectiveness. The Faculty of Religious Studies places primary emphasis upon the quality of the contribution to scholarship, as judged by the tenured faculty of the unit and by the reviewers in the candidate’s sub-field. The publications that carry the most weight include scholarly books and monographs; critical editions of texts and critical translations; and chapter-length works for refereed journals, edited volumes, and encyclopedias. Other publications, including edited volumes, shorter scholarly writings, and shorter encyclopedia essays, count as well, although they are less significant indicators of scholarly contribution. Because of the long period of time that passes between acceptance of material and its publication by presses and journals, the unit allows candidates to submit works in press as evidence of scholarly contribution. Participation in collaborative research and efforts at external grant support for research are encouraged and carry positive weight in assessment of scholarship. However, such opportunities are too unevenly available across the subfields within religious studies to constitute a Faculty-wide criterion of successful scholarship. Hence, the lack of such activity will not distract from an otherwise distinguished research record. Decisions on tenure and promotion to associate professor depend in the area of scholarship upon positive responses to the following series of questions:

a. Does the candidate's written scholarly work give evidence of distinguished achievement at the Assistant Professor Level and promise of continuing excellence?

b. Does the work include a substantial body of writing which is scholarly and academic, not merely popular, and which is judged excellent by peers within and outside of the Faculty?

 c. Does the work make a distinct and acknowledged contribution to the academic study of religion?

 d. Does the work give evidence that the candidate has embarked on a continuing program of high-quality research and publication that will extend beyond the point of tenure?

2. **Teaching**. In addition to scholarship, tenure and promotion decisions depend upon an assessment of the teaching and service contributions of the candidate. Effective classroom teaching is expected of all faculty members, regardless of rank. Moreover, faculty are expected to teach courses not only as electives in their field of specialization, but as general service courses that meet the unit's degree requirements and the university's general studies requirements. For tenure and promotion a candidate should have received student and peer evaluations that give positive evidence of effective teaching in the classroom and in working individually with undergraduate and graduate students, including on honors, thesis, and dissertation projects. Exceptional teaching carries positive weight in tenure and promotion decisions, but not to the exclusion of scholarly contributions.

3. **Service**. The Faculty of Religious Studies expects candidates for tenure and promotion to contribute in a serious and sustained manner to their profession, the university, and the Faculty. Contributions to the general public are also encouraged. For tenure and promotion to associate professor, candidates should contribute all three forms of service.

**PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR**

The Faculty of Religious Studies expects that the candidate for promotion to full Professor will have made substantial contributions in the three areas of scholarship, teaching and service. It also recognizes that the profiles of successful candidates for promotion will vary depending on the particular talents and interests of the individual. The Faculty of Religious Studies requires for promotion a significant record of excellent and sustained scholarship since promotion to Associate Professor.

Participation in collaborative research and efforts at external grant support for research are encouraged and carry positive weight in assessment of scholarship. However, such opportunities are too unevenly available across the subfields within religious studies to constitute a unit -wide criterion of successful scholarship. Hence, the lack of such activity will not distract from an otherwise distinguished scholarly record. The record must be such that the Faculty of Religious Studies and outside evaluators judges it to have made, or to have the potential to make, a major impact within the candidate's field. The Faculty of Religious Studies expects the candidate to have met or exceeded the unit’s standards for teaching and service as evaluated in annual performance reviews. It also is expected that at the time of promotion the scope of the candidate’s service will include contributions at the national or international level.

**Appendix IV. Religious Studies Criteria for Probationary Review of Tenure-Track Faculty**

Decisions for retention shall be based on the candidate's showing promise of being able to fulfill the criteria for tenure during the probationary period.

The Probationary Review should demonstrate clear progress toward tenurable levels of performance in the following three areas:

1. **Scholarship**: The faculty member should have published or had accepted for publication a book and/or articles of high scholarly quality that show evidence of a significant research agenda beyond the dissertation. He or she should have also presented evidence of significant activity in scholarly meetings and professional conferences. Efforts at grant support for research and participation in collaborative research (projects) are encouraged and carry positive weight. However, the lack of such activity will not detract from an otherwise distinguished research record.

2. **Teaching**: The quality of a faculty member’s teaching should have reached a tenurable level, with the expectation that this level will be maintained through the rest of the probationary period. In addition, the faculty member should have developed his or her own courses and worked on graduate student and/or honors student committees. We also encourage candidates to become familiar with guidelines and exemplary models provided on CLAS and University Provost websites.

3. **Service**: The Faculty tries to keep the services of probationary faculty to a reasonable level. By the third year, however, the faculty member should have served on unit committees and assisted with appropriate interdisciplinary units in the university. Where appropriate, service to the profession in some capacity is also highly desirable.

**Appendix V. History Criteria for Probationary and Progress-toward-Tenure Review of Tenure-Track Faculty**

**For the probationary review:**

a. **Research**: The candidate should be engaged in an active program of research and writing directed toward meeting tenure requirements, detailed in the document, “Promotion and Tenure Standards,” contained in the Department’s Policies. The candidate’s primary objective should ordinarily be a scholarly monograph; the candidate should have made significant steps toward satisfying the requirements, as demonstrated by completed chapters of the monograph, presentations of papers at professional meetings, archival research and other signs of progress that will produce the needed monograph manuscript for

submission to a press by August of the 4th year and yield at least 2 refereed articles/book chapters. At this point at the beginning of the 3rd year, in order to meet the expectations of the 4th year progress to tenure review, 1 article should have been published or in press, another well along in preparation, and the introduction and 2 chapters of the monograph manuscript completed. The 4-page research statement should provide a clear statement about the current research program and include information about the next major research project what will be developed as the current agenda is completed. That next project should yield another monograph and include more refereed articles/book chapters. It should be evident from the research statement that by the opening of the 6th year, this next research agenda will have yielded some outcome, e.g., research presentation(s) at a scholarly meeting, article ready to be submitted for review, article in press, and so on.. The Subcommittee will evaluate the significance of the research program, assessing whether it is likely to make an important contribution to historical scholarship. The Subcommittee will look for a clear agenda for continuing scholarship, as well as evidence that the candidate is engaged in preparing articles or book chapters for publication in refereed journals/books.

b. **Teaching**: The candidate should have carried out the undergraduate teaching assignments related to his or her position, and present syllabi and other evidence of conformance with Departmental teaching policy. The department expects a period of adjustment to the teaching role. Candidate student evaluation scores should be within the upper two-thirds of the faculty. Peer evaluations should also indicate the candidate is either approaching or at department norms. A candidate with teaching evaluation scores below departmental norms should provide a plan to bring these scores to average levels by the 4th year review. By the 3rd year, at least 2 courses should be being taught successfully, and two more either taught or under development. Syllabi and instructional materials should demonstrate well designed courses. The statement of teaching philosophy (two pages) should set out a clear instructional program.

c. **Service**: Candidates will be expected to show a level of service appropriate to someone at the entering level of their career. Evidence of professional service should be in place in the form of participation in scholarly meetings or associations. Some minimal service on department, college or university committees should have occurred or be planned for the 3rd year.

**Appendix VI. History Criteria for Progress-toward Tenure Reviews**

**For second year reviews:**

a. **Research**: The candidate should be engaged in an active program of research and writing directed toward meeting tenure requirements, detailed in the document, “Promotion and Tenure Standards,” contained in the Department’s Policies. The candidate’s primary objective should ordinarily be a scholarly monograph; the candidate should have made significant steps toward satisfying the requirements, as demonstrated by completed chapters of the monograph, presentations of papers at professional meetings, archival research and other signs of progress. The review will evaluate the significance of the research program, assessing whether it is likely to make an important contribution to historical scholarship. The review will also look for a clear agenda for continuing scholarship over the next two years leading to the 4th year benchmark of submission of the manuscript, as well as evidence that the candidate is engaged in preparing articles or book chapters for publication in refereed journals/books.

b. **Teaching**: The candidate should have carried out the undergraduate teaching assignments related to his or her position, and present syllabi and other evidence of conformance with Departmental teaching policy. The department expects a period of adjustment to the teaching role. Candidate student evaluation scores should be within the upper two-thirds of the faculty. A candidate with teaching evaluation scores below departmental norms should provide a plan to bring these scores to average levels by the 4th year review.

c. **Service**: Candidates will be expected to show a level of service appropriate to someone at the entering level of their career.

**Fourth Year Review**

a. **Research**: The candidate must present evidence of having submitted a book-

length manuscript to a press. The candidate should have published at least one refereed article/book chapter and have definite plans to place another article/book chapters in refereed journals/books within the next two years. The department will also evaluate the quality of the research completed, assessing whether it makes an important contribution to historical research.

b. **Teaching**: The candidate will have gone beyond the basic requirements of his

or her position, and will have made a contribution to the pedagogical mission

of the Department, by way of new courses, new applications within existing

courses, or other comparable contributions. The candidate should be prepared

to participate in the graduate program commensurate with the opportunity to

do so, and should provide evidence of working with graduate students a well

as undergraduates. The candidate’s teaching evaluation scores should be at

department norms.

c. **Service**: The candidate will provide evidence of professional service, such as serving on committees in scholarly organizations, participating as a panelist in scholarly conferences, writing book reviews, or participating in local historical activities in the community. The candidate should have served on a departmental, college, or university committee.

**Fifth Year Review**

a. **Research**: by the fall semester of the 5th year, the monograph manuscript

should be in final stages of revision so that a manuscript will be ready to send to outside reviewers in the spring semester (e.g., April) as part of the 6th year review process. At least 2 articles should have been published or be in press. The file should tangibly indicate that the next research agenda is in place, e.g., preparation of a research grant proposal, scholarly presentation, and so on.

b. **Teaching**: by the opening of this year, a successful teaching program of courses should be in place and successfully be taught. Where appropriate, some involvement with the graduate program should be evident.

c. **Service**: by this year, the candidate should have served on some department, college, or university committees and be participating in disciplinary associations or meetings.

**Appendix VII. Religious Studies Criteria for Review and Promotion of Lecturers**

1. The Faculty of Religious Studies currently has three categories: lecturer, senior lecturer, and principal lecturer. As members of the Faculty, all lecturers share Faculty responsibilities as described elsewhere within Faculty policies and procedures consistent with university policy. All divide their efforts between the areas of teaching, advising, and service, with service usually constituting between 10-20% of their workload.

2. **REVIEWS**

Periodic reviews of lecturers are conducted by the Faculty Head and Personnel Committee. In evaluating the performance of lecturers teaching, advising, service and overall performance is based on criteria used in the evaluation of tenure-track and tenured faculty. Renewal is dependent upon demonstrated excellence in teaching and competence in service requirements. High quality in teaching is expected and is normally judged by use of the unit’s student teaching evaluations and faculty evaluations. The candidate for renewal will normally have also shown ability in the area of curriculum development for example, by developing and offering new courses or by redesigning existing courses.

3. **PROMOTION TO SENIOR LECTURER**

Normally, senior lecturers hold a doctorate or appropriate terminal degree and have a minimum of five years of successful, college-level teaching experience. Requests for promotion to senior lecturer should occur at the time of the normal review. Promotion recognizes a quality of work higher than that expected for renewal. As in the renewal criteria, the case for promotion will rest most heavily on demonstrated excellence in teaching. Evidence of continued professional development will also be considered important.

4. **PROMOTION TO PRINCIPAL LECTURER**

Requests for promotion to principal lecturer should occur at the time of the normal review. Normally, the candidate for promotion to principal lecturers holds a doctorate or appropriate terminal degree and normally has a minimum of eight years of successful, college-level teaching experience. The case for promotion will rest on demonstrated excellence in teaching, advising and continued related professional development. Teaching awards, publications, research grants, and fellowships will be viewed as positive indicators of continued professional development.

**APPENDIX XIII: Philosophy Criteria for Review and Promotion of Lecturers**

1. RESPONSIBILITIES

The Faculty of Philosophy currently has three categories: lecturer, senior lecturer, and principal lecturer. As members of the Faculty, all lecturers share Faculty responsibilities as described elsewhere within Faculty policies and procedures, consistent with university policy. All divide their efforts between the areas of teaching and service, with teaching usually constituting 90% of their workload and service usually constituting 10% of their workload.

2. REVIEWS

Periodic reviews of lecturers are conducted by the Faculty Head and Performance Review Committee. In evaluating the performance of lecturers teaching and service and overall performance is based on criteria used in the evaluation of tenure-track and tenured faculty. Renewal is dependent upon demonstrated excellence in teaching and competence in service requirements. High quality in teaching is expected and is normally judged by the unit’s student teaching evaluations and faculty evaluations. The candidate for renewal will normally have also shown ability in the area of curriculum development, for example, by developing and offering new courses or by redesigning existing courses.

3. PROMOTION TO SENIOR LECTURER

Normally, senior lecturers hold a doctorate or appropriate terminal degree and have a minimum of five years of successful, college-level teaching experience. Requests for promotion to senior lecturer should occur at the time of the normal review. Promotion recognizes a quality of work higher than that expected for renewal. As in the renewal criteria, the case for promotion will rest most heavily on demonstrated excellence in teaching. Evidence of continued professional development will also be considered important.

4. PROMOTION TO PRINCIPAL LECTURER

Requests for promotion to principal lecturer should occur at the time of the normal review. Normally, the candidate for promotion to principal lecturer holds a doctorate or appropriate terminal degree and normally has a minimum of eight years of successful, college-level teaching experience. The case for promotion will rest on demonstrated excellence in teaching and continued related professional development. Teaching awards, teaching innovations, participation in teaching workshops or conferences, mentoring, publications, research grants, fellowships, and contributing to the intellectual life of the unit are examples of positive indicators of continued professional development.