CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY:
THIRD YEAR REVIEW TENURE AND PROMOTION

The Department of History
The Dorothy F. Schmidt College of Arts and Letters
Florida Atlantic University


I. AWARDING OF TENURE

A. General Policies

1. Tenure at Florida Atlantic University is the recognition that the faculty member so honored is an established member of the academic profession, possessing a terminal degree or qualification appropriate to the discipline, and having clearly demonstrated the commitment and ability to continue to be a scholar, contributing to the field of knowledge through original work and quality teaching in the best traditions of the professoriate.

Candidates for tenure need to have produced a body of work that is original and makes a contribution to the field. Demonstration of such scholarly productivity that merits tenure and promotion shall include publication of a peer-reviewed scholarly book in a reputable academic press or a series of peer reviewed publications in reputable national or international journals.

The annual evaluations, reflecting assignments, provide the primary indication of professional growth leading toward tenure. The awarding of tenure is based upon the judgment that the individual will have a lifelong commitment to scholarship and teaching at the university level and to meeting the needs of the department, college, and university. The individual must also have demonstrated commitment through service to the university and the community.

2. Tenure shall normally be considered in the sixth year of a faculty member's continuous service.

3. To be recommended for tenure, an individual must normally have attained, or be eligible to soon attain, qualifications for the rank of Associate Professor at Florida Atlantic University (see Section V.A.2, below).

4. Normally, no individual shall be recommended for tenure until after he/she begins working at Florida Atlantic University unless he/she already holds the rank of Associate Professor or Professor and is tenured at another accredited university.

B. Procedures

1. Tenure reviews within the department shall be conducted by the department Faculty Evaluation Committee, composed as described in Section II.A.1, above.

2. External reviewers shall be selected and contacted according to University policy as articulated in the University Promotion and Tenure guidelines, which state that the
candidate must have at least three current letters of support from external reviewers, the majority of whom, but preferably all, must be full professors from PhD granting institutions or nationally recognized four year colleges. A list of potential referees should be compiled by the Chair/Director and the senior faculty in the discipline: the candidate should have the opportunity to review the list for any conflicts of interest. These experts should be letters from independent experts in the field who can evaluate the faculty member’s work; letters from co-authors, dissertation advisors or personal friends are inappropriate.

3. Internal letters for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor are no longer required as per revised university P and T guidelines for 2010-2011

4. The faculty member being considered for tenure shall submit to the chair of the department Faculty Evaluation Committee two (2) copies of the primary tenure portfolio and one supplementary portfolio. The portfolio must include everything required in the University's "Promotion and Tenure Portfolio Guidelines," updated annually by the Provost's Office. It will also include the following:

a. A curriculum vitae that follows the template provided

b. Copies of book contracts and/or letters from journal editors for published and forthcoming works; these documents will go into the Scholarship section of the portfolio.

n.b.: Candidates are responsible for presenting a “clean” dossier that adheres to department, college and university guidelines for promotion and tenure. The dossier should not be presented to the Faculty Evaluation Committee as a draft of a work in progress. Any questions regarding composition of the dossier should be directed to the chair of the Faculty Evaluation Committee well in advance of the deadline for submission of the portfolio.

The date for submission of the portfolio will be determined by the Provost's Guidelines.

5. After reviewing the candidate's dossier, the Faculty Evaluation Committee shall meet with the faculty member under review to discuss issues relevant to the review. In this meeting the candidate shall be invited to discuss with the committee any considerations which he or she feels may need special explanation or may not otherwise be adequately addressed in the review process.

6. Following the interview, the committee shall prepare a report that evaluates the candidate's performance in each of the three areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. The committee's report shall include a summary recommendation as to whether the faculty member should be recommended for tenure or not. This report, and the candidate's complete dossier, shall be made available to those faculty members who hold tenure in the Department of History in The Schmidt College at least ten (10) days in advance of the meeting of those members to vote on the recommendation for tenure.

7. No sooner than ten working days after the Faculty Evaluation Committee's report on the candidate is made available, the chair shall convene the members of the faculty who hold tenure in the Department of History in The Schmidt College to consider the report and vote by secret ballot on the question of whether or not to recommend the candidate for tenure. In addition, a secret ballot will be held with regard to promotion from the rank of
assistant professor to associate professor. If the faculty assembled choose, preliminary votes may be taken concerning the candidate's accomplishments in one or more of the specific areas of evaluation but such votes shall not be binding on the final vote as to recommending tenure and shall not be reported outside the department.

a. only those eligible faculty members who are present for the discussion may vote on a tenure application.

b. All voting on tenure and promotion applications will remain confidential. Violation of confidentiality may result in disciplinary action.

c. The department chair must be present, but does not vote at this meeting. The chair’s letter constitutes his/her vote on tenure and promotion cases.

8. Following the tenured faculty's vote, and consistent with university policies, the chair shall add to the candidate's dossier a letter that reports the results of the secret-ballot vote and the chair's personal recommendation, and provides an appraisal of the candidate's record documenting the chair's recommendation. In the event that the chair does not concur in the recommendation of the tenured faculty, the chair shall explain this disagreement to them in writing. The chair shall then transmit the entire dossier to the Dean for further levels of review. The chair's letter shall be made available immediately to the candidate under review.

II. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF TEACHING, RESEARCH AND SERVICE

Depending on the status (i.e., tenured or tenure earning) faculty members’ teaching will be assessed and documented in two and/or three ways: Student Evaluation; Peer Evaluation; Chair Evaluation. Tenured faculty members’ teaching will be evaluated through Student and Chair evaluation, while tenure-earning faculty members’ Teaching will also include Peer Evaluation.

A. Teaching: History faculty members are expected to challenge and inspire their students in the classroom, demonstrating pedagogical currency by regular revision of course syllabi and materials. Despite the limitations of the SPOT forms, the department acknowledges the validity of student input as one part of a holistic approach to the evaluation of teaching. Yet, faculty in the History Department also value other factors which also provide evidence of a faculty member’s commitment to excellence in teaching, evidence which the chair uses in determining performance for the annual evaluation of a faculty member.

Student Evaluation obtained through the University Student Perception of Teaching Form.¹ In 2005, The University Faculty Senate approved items 20 (Rate the quality of instruction as it contributed to your learning for the course) and 21 (What is your rating of this instructor compared to other instructors you have had?) for the Teaching and Evaluation table in the P&T portfolio. Candidates must also include the SPOT summary sheets for each course taught during the period under consideration. The Chair will tabulate the responses to

¹ (The SPOT form was changed in Fall 2005. While Q 8 on the old form (overall evaluation) may continue to be used for P&T portfolios that cover a period of years prior to Fall 2005, annual evaluations and P&T portfolios need to recognize the new SPOT form.)
question 20 on the SPOT form and submit to the committee a ranking of faculty by SPOT. All faculty are expected to strive to meet or exceed the college mean in their classes.

1. Peer (faculty) Evaluation for Faculty
   a. Peer (faculty) Evaluation for tenure-earning faculty will include a written evaluation and critique of the candidate's teaching, completed by a tenured member of the Florida Atlantic University History faculty based on at least one classroom visitation during the year preceding annual evaluation. The faculty evaluator will be selected by the Faculty Evaluation Committee in consultation with the candidate.

   b. Peer (faculty) Evaluation for tenure-track faculty will involve the annual submission of syllabi and other appropriate teaching materials to the Faculty Evaluation Committee for review and response. Tenured faculty may request classroom visits, and may be encouraged to participate in Department, College, and University forums on teaching.

   c. The Faculty Evaluation Committee will determine whether a peer's teaching evaluation should be regarded as an indicator of Excellent, Above Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Below Satisfactory, or teaching. Since teaching assignments, efforts, and achievements will vary from instructor to instructor, this rating cannot be determined formulaically.

2. Chair’s Assessment of Other Contributing Factors:
   a. Creation of new courses or significant revision of existing courses
   b. Creation of programs, workshops, or symposia related to teaching
   c. Service as chair or member of Honor’s Thesis, Master’s Thesis, or Ph.D. Dissertation.
   d. Director of an independent study course at either the undergraduate or graduate level
   e. Teaching awards or professional recognition for teaching.
   f. Publications of teaching materials, presentations related to teaching.
   g. Contributions to the college’s interdisciplinary programs.
   h. Participation in pedagogy workshops.
   i. Unsolicited commentaries of students, faculty and other pertinent information in the possession of the chair.

3. Evaluation of Teaching

   Excellent: The rating of Excellent reflects the highest level of performance in SPOT scores and most of the areas under categories 1 and 2 as assessed by the chair. Peer evaluations will also be considered in those years when they are conducted as part of the annual evaluation process. To receive an Excellent in teaching ordinarily the statistical mean on the SPOT evaluations (on question 20 as stipulated in the University’s Promotion and Tenure Guidelines) will be a 1.75 or better. It is understood that the standard deviation will be a factor in determining the evaluation.

   Above Satisfactory: The rating of Above Satisfactory reflects the highest level of performance in most of the areas under category 2, as well as the consideration of peer evaluations. To receive a Above Satisfactory in teaching ordinarily the statistical mean on the SPOT evaluations (on question 20 as stipulated by the University’s Promotion and Tenure Guidelines) will be 2.25 or better. It is understood that the standard deviation will be a factor in determining the evaluation.

---

2 Faculty members should provide the chair with appropriate documentation, e.g. syllabi of new or heavily revised courses, e-mails related to participation in teaching programs, workshops, etc.
Satisfactory: The rating of Satisfactory reflects an acceptable level of performance in most areas cited. To receive a Satisfactory rating in teaching ordinarily the statistical mean on the SPOT evaluations (on question 20 as stipulated by the University’s Promotion and Tenure Guidelines) will be a 2.75 or better. It is understood that the standard deviation will be a factor in determining the evaluation.

Below Satisfactory: The rating of Below Satisfactory reflects less than adequate performance in most areas cited. To receive a Below Satisfactory rating in teaching ordinarily the statistical mean on the SPOT evaluations (on question 20 as stipulated in the University’s Promotion and Tenure Guidelines) will be a 3.00 or a lower number (meaning better). It is understood that the standard deviation will be a factor in determining the evaluation.

B. Scholarship, Publication and Creative Activity. Production of historical scholarship is a lengthy and labor-intensive process; it often includes searching out numerous primary sources from a variety of genres (oral histories, archival materials, material evidence) and locations in the U.S. and abroad. It also involves extensive engagement with primary sources; these sources are analyzed, compared with other sources and then synthesized into original written work that propels the field forward, aids colleagues in the field, evaluates and/or challenges traditional hypotheses to determine their validity, and may incorporate other materials from other disciplines.

Publication of books in peer reviewed presses, and publication of peer reviewed book chapters and articles - is more significant in granting tenure and promotion than publication of non-refereed books, book chapters and articles. In evaluating a candidate's performance in the areas of scholarship the department will consider such evidence as:

1. Publication of a single-authored refereed scholarly book that appears in print during the year under review
   a. Publication of refereed edited works, textbooks and anthologies
   b. Publication of annotated and edited translations of lengthy primary source manuscripts
   c. Publication of books that involve extensive editing and preparation of unpublished archival sources (this incorporates codicology, paleography, and determination of the provenance of the various manuscripts)
   d. Publication of refereed journal articles, evaluated on basis of scholarship
   e. Publication of refereed book chapters or articles in edited collections
   f. Formal acknowledgement from the publisher of scholarly book that all editorial matters are complete and that manuscript will soon enter the production process
   g. Receipt of major external research grant, award, or fellowship to pursue scholarly research
   h. Public programming (exhibition, etc) in museums and other cultural and educational institutions when original scholarship and rigorous scholarly peer review is a significant part of the involvement

2. a. Editing of journals and/or other scholarly publications
   b. Creation of bibliographies and databases for use by other scholars
   c. Encyclopedia and dictionary entries, evaluated on their merits with attention to
their contribution to scholarship
d. Receipt of advance book contract
e. Papers published in conference proceedings
f. Book reviews in refereed journals
g. Papers presented at professional meetings, evaluated on their own merits
h. Service as a commentator at a session of a scholarly meeting
i. Refereeing manuscripts for scholarly journals and presses, and grant proposals for funding agencies
j. Smaller grants, awards and fellowships received in support of research and publication
k. Completed applications for major grants
l. Demonstration of substantial progress on a book manuscript
m. Acknowledgement from publisher that article or book chapter is under review

3. In reference to the above three categories of publications, further distinctions will be made based upon the following – whether the works in a given year are:

a. In press: books and/or articles that have been completed but are still in press are taken by the department as evidence of significant research/creative activity (when candidates can document the successful completion and acceptance of the manuscript). Forthcoming books--like articles accepted for publication but still forthcoming—are considered a legitimate element in a candidate’s application for promotion and tenure.

b. Under contract: Works under contract but still to be completed are taken by the department as evidence of professional activity, but they do not carry the weight of publications that are in print or in press.

c. In progress: The department expects candidates for promotion and tenure to have solid plans for further long-range project(s) in their field. All candidates for promotion and tenure should discuss their project(s) in development along with listing and describing the publications in hand discussed in categories 1-3 above

5. **Evaluation of research productivity**.—Based on categories above, faculty members will be assessed with reference to their production of the following:

**Excellent:** a scholarly book that appears in print during the year under review OR a record of continued publication, including one from category 2 and one from categories 2 or 3

**Above Satisfactory:** a strong record of continued publication; either one from category 2, OR two from category 3 during the current year

**Satisfactory:** a record of continued scholarly activity including one from category 3 during the current year

**Below Satisfactory:** no scholarly activity for the current year and one from category 1-3 during preceding year
V. C. Service. A guiding principle in service is collegiality demonstrated via good citizenship in the university, community, and the profession.

1. Assignment of service in the History department varies according to professorial rank; the typical assistant professor should have only a modest assignment to service; more service is expected of associate and full professors. Tenured faculty members aspiring to the rank of professor are expected to perform leadership roles on department, college and/or university committees, and engage in professional and/or community service as well.

The following categories of service will be taken into consideration:

(a) University service: membership on and active participation in Departmental, College or University committees, councils, and senates, task forces, ad hoc committees, and special projects; supervision or active involvement in student clubs and organizations; involvement in university advancement or enrichment activities (such as nurturing relationships with donors, writing departmental newsletters and mailings, or organizing/participating in public lectures and events).

(b) Professional service: service to state, regional, and national professional associations; service on governmental or institutional boards, agencies, and commissions; service to other institutions of higher learning (such as external program review); editorial service, including serving on editorial and advisory boards, acting as editor for academic publications, and reviewing of manuscripts (articles, texts, and books).

(c) Community service: active participation in local, regional, and national organizations related to the faculty member’s research and expertise, including such things as: service to schools and other institutions (such as museums, libraries, archives, historical societies, foundations, think tanks, etc); academic outreach that brings scholarly expertise to the public sphere through such activities as involvement in continuing education programs, participating in media interviews, giving public lectures and presentations, writing for periodicals, blogs, or websites.

2. Evaluation of service: Based on the categories above, faculty members will be assessed with reference to the following:

Excellent: a faculty member makes an active, substantial, and consistent contribution to university service (typically including a leadership role, such as chairing a committee, or other labor-intensive assignment), and should engage in meaningful professional or community service activities; or a faculty member engages in extraordinary professional and community service while making a contribution to university service.

Above Satisfactory: a faculty member makes a substantial contribution to university service; or a faculty member makes a meaningful contribution to professional and community service.

Satisfactory: a faculty member contributes to university service by serving on a committee, and makes a modest contribution to professional or community service.
Below Satisfactory: modest amount of professional, community, or university service

III. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO RANKS OF ASSISTANT, ASSOCIATE AND FULL PROFESSOR

A. Criteria for Faculty Ranks

1. **Assistant Professor.** Appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor requires that individuals hold the terminal earned degree appropriate to the discipline. Appointment to this rank is made on the judgment that individuals are ready and capable of reaching tenure within a maximum six-year period. Evidence of potential for excellence in scholarship and for quality teaching is required.

2. **Associate Professor.** Appointment or promotion to this rank is recognition that the individual has reached a status in the discipline appropriate to a life-long member of the academic world and has clearly demonstrated ability as a scholar through research and publication. In addition, the candidate must have a consistently good record of teaching, evidence of improvement from the initial appointment, and commitment to service.

All candidates are expected to show substantial scholarly or creative achievement since their appointment to FAU as assistant professors. Quality of research is the primary criterion. This is verified by at least three letters from external reviewers (the majority, preferably all, should be accomplished full professors in the candidate’s field) and by the majority vote of tenured faculty members in the department, as well as by the Department representative’s report on the tenure and promotion meeting and the Chair's letter and recommendation.

Candidates for promotion and tenure are expected to have a single-authored peer reviewed scholarly book in print or in press when they become candidates for promotion and tenure or to have the equivalent, in refereed publications in journals (or book chapters in refereed volumes). Any published research that propels the field forward does so on both the national and international level.

Further evidence of scholarship includes other items mentioned in section IV B above. (One is not expected to achieve all of these, but some such evidence of scholarly activity at the national level is required.)

a. Those appointed at the rank of Associate Professor shall normally apply for tenure after one or more years of service at the University; as described in Section III.A.3, above. A candidate promoted to Associate Professor shall normally be recommended for tenure at the time of promotion.

b. **Progress of Associate Professors Toward Promotion to Professor:** Department chairs must apprise newly tenured faculty of expectations for promotion during the faculty members’ first year in rank as associate professors.

If they choose, associate professors may have their progress towards promotion to professor periodically reviewed by at least two full professors in their department, in consultation with the department chair.
If the department chair is not a full professor, he/she may have his/her progress towards promotion to professor reviewed by the Dean.

3. **Professor:** Appointment or promotion to this rank is recognition of demonstrated significant achievement since promotion to Associate Professor in the areas of research and publication, teaching, and strong service within the university and externally.

   a. Demonstrated merit, not years of service, shall be the primary consideration in determining the case for promotion to Professor. Typically, candidates will have held the rank of associate professor for at least five years.

   b. **Criteria for promotion:** During their time as associate professors, candidates are expected to have maintained a rigorous record of research and publication of work that is original and makes a significant contribution to the field. This record of productivity includes publication of an additional scholarly book in a peer reviewed press, refereed journal articles, and chapters in books. The quality of this research is more important than any fixed quantity of publications. This quality is verified by at least three letters from external reviewers (all must be accomplished full professors in the candidate’s field) and by the vote of the full professors in the department, as well as by the department representative’s report on the tenure and promotion meeting and the chair's letter and recommendation. It is a given that any research that propels the field forward does so on both the national and international level.

   Further evidence of scholarship includes other items mentioned in section IV B above. (One is not expected to achieve all of these, but strong evidence of scholarly activity at the national and/or international level is required.)

   c. Reviews for promotion to Professor shall follow the same procedures described in III. B. above, with the following exceptions:

      1. In the portfolio the candidate shall clearly designate those activities and accomplishments which have occurred since promotion to Associate Professor.

      2. The portfolio shall include at least two internal letters focusing on service. The faculty member who is applying for promotion shall, in the spring term preceding consideration for promotion, recommend to the chair the names of at least two potential internal referees to be contacted for letters focusing on the candidate's service to Florida Atlantic University during their time in rank as associate professor. Internal letters should be written by senior associate professors or full professors. Candidates should provide a brief statement of why these colleagues are appropriate evaluators of their work. Only letters solicited by the chairperson will be included in the candidate's dossier.

      3. All external letters of support must come from full professors from PhD granting institutions or nationally recognized four year colleges.

      4. No sooner than ten working days after the Faculty Evaluation Committee's report on the candidate is made available, the chair shall convene a meeting of tenured History faculty to consider the dossier and report. After this discussion, the full
professors will vote by secret ballot on the question of whether or not to recommend the candidate for promotion to the rank of professor.

If the department has fewer than three full professors, a third full professor in a complementary field outside the History department may be selected to review the dossier and vote on the case. The third full professor will be chosen by the chair in consultation with the candidate. If the faculty assembled choose, preliminary votes may be taken concerning the candidate's accomplishments in one or more of the specific areas of evaluation but such votes shall not be binding on the final vote as to recommending tenure and shall not be reported outside the department.
It is recommended that every faculty member coming up for third year review or tenure and/or promotion complete a curriculum vitae following this format.

Candidates may also include categories relative to their respective fields

Curriculum Vitae

Date

PERSONAL

Name:

Office Phone:

Current Academic Rank:

Primary Department:

Secondary or Joint Appointments:

HIGHER EDUCATION

Institutional (institution; degree; date conferred):

Non-Institutional (description; dates):

Certification, licensure (description; board or agency; dates):

EXPERIENCE

Academic institutions; rank/status; dates):

Relevant non-academic employment (employers; title; responsibilities; dates):

HONORS, AWARDS AND POST-DOCTORAL FELLOWSHIPS

FUNDED RESEARCH
(include all grants received in the last five years, identifying the principal investigator and the amounts and dates of the awards):

RESEARCH PUBLICATIONS
For each publication listed, the following information must be included, in the following order:

--author (list co-authors in order of contribution)
--title
--publisher or name of journal
--date (most recent publications first)
--page numbers

Scholarly books published:
Co-authored books:

Edited books:

Juried or refereed journal articles:

Chapters in books

Abstracts:

--Other works accepted for publication (under contract):

Papers Presented --ALSO indicate whether paper presented eventually resulted in a published work, and give full citation of that published work)

Book reviews

Conference proceedings

Seminar or conference panel member

Catalogue work; etc.

PUBLICATIONS IN TEACHING
For each publication listed, the following information must be included, in the following order:

--author (list co-authors in order of contribution)
--title
--publisher or name of journal
--date (most recent publications first)
--page numbers

WORKS IN PROGRESS
In this section, list works under review, using same guidelines listed for the section above on publications

FOR THIRD YEAR REVIEW ONLY—LIST WORKS IN PROGRESS (INTENDED FOR SUBMISSION TO JOURNALS OR PUBLISHERS IN THE NOT-TOO DISTANT FUTURE)

CREATIVE ACTIVITY
Note: This section is of particular relevance to faculty in School of the Arts

Juried exhibitions (specify solo or group)

Conference presentations

Commercial CD recordings (specify nature of performance and recording
Performances (specify, e.g. solo performance, chamber musician, conductor, role in play, etc.)

Creative works premiered, published or recorded (music, literature, drama, film, performance art, etc.)

Supportive creative endeavors (e.g. set design, costume design, lighting, etc.)

**TEACHING**

Teaching Awards Received:

Teaching Specialization (courses taught):

New courses added to the curriculum

Thesis Advising (chairman or committee member; topic; student name; date):

**SERVICE**

Department College and University Committees

Departmental Service (e.g. creation of websites, recruitment, co-ordination of special events)

Administrative Responsibilities:

Assigned Community Service:

**PROFESSIONAL SERVICE**

Editorial responsibilities:

Professional and Honorary Organizations (member; officer; date)
FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY
CURRICULUM VITAE FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

CERTIFICATION

(Must be signed by candidate and by chairperson)

I hereby certify that the information provided in this curriculum vitae is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand that if I have knowingly provided false information or omitted relevant information, I may be subject to disciplinary action, including termination.

_________________________________________  ____________________________
Signature of Candidate                       Date

_________________________________________  ____________________________
Signature of Chairperson                     Date