

12. Guidelines for Review of Probationary Faculty

- A. The Promotion and Tenure Committee, composed of all tenured faculty, will evaluate assistant professors in the fall semester of their third year in residence. Each spring, in odd-numbered years, the Committee will elect a Chair for the following two years from members holding the rank of professor; for each candidate to be reviewed the Committee will also elect two members who with the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will constitute a three-member Subcommittee, who will present the candidate's file for discussion. The preparation, evaluation, and confidentiality of each candidate's file will follow procedures outlined in the document "Promotion and Tenure Procedures," contained in the Department's Policies, except that no outside letters are employed.
- B. The primary criterion for evaluation is whether the candidate is on course to achieve tenure in the sixth year, as outlined in the document "Promotion and Tenure Standards," contained in the Department's Policies. Retention should be based on "excellent performance and the prospect of continued excellence" (ACD 506-07). The letter of evaluation, which all Committee members attending sign, should "accurately appraise progress toward earning tenure" (ACD 506-06).
- C. The candidate will make available to the Committee, through the Department Chair, a file for review by August 15. This file will include a copy of the candidate's c.v., with complete citations, a personal statement, a statement of teaching philosophy, course syllabi, copies of published or in-press work, and any additional material the candidate wishes to have the Committee consider. The personal statement(s) should address the candidate's accomplishments and future plans in the areas of research, teaching and service (four pages for research and two pages each for teaching and service). The Department Chair will supplement this file with course evaluations and peer reviews of classroom teaching performance as well as copies of progress to tenure and any other previous reports and, where indicated, programs for rectifying deficiencies.
- D. The candidate's Subcommittee will review and discuss the candidate's file and prepare and distribute a letter to the Committee at the time of the meeting summarizing its findings and assessment according to the standards set forth in paragraph B above, measured according to the following standards:
 1. For the third year 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.
- E. The Committee will meet to discuss the progress of the candidate, taking into consideration the views and advice of the Subcommittee. At the conclusion of the discussion, members of the Committee will vote to recommend that the candidate be issued a regular contract, a conditional contract, or a terminal contract, indicating the reasoning behind its recommendation. The Committee Chair will compose a letter, signed by members of the Committee in attendance, describing the discussion and reporting the Committee's recommendation, noting differences of opinion and

recommendation where appropriate. That letter accompanies the candidate's file through the remainder of the probationary evaluation process.

- F. The Department Chair will compose her/his own letter of evaluation and recommendation to be forwarded with the candidate's file.
- G. After the candidate's file has been returned from the Provost's Office, the Department Chair and the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will meet with the candidate to discuss the review. They will discuss any concerns raised in the course of the review and, if necessary, devise a plan to address such concerns that will specify what the candidate will do to rectify the problems identified in order to meet the requirements for promotion and tenure.

2. Second, Fourth, and Fifth Progress to Tenure Year Reviews

- a. For these progress to tenure reviews, the Department Chair, Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and immediate past Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee meet with the candidate to conduct these reviews. The candidate prepares a brief, 1-page statement discussing current progress and provide3s a current C.V. Following the meeting of this group with the candidate, the Chair sends an evaluation to the Divisional Dean of Humanities.

1. 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.

2. 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 as 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.

3. 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.