

Department of History Tenure and Promotion Criteria

I. PRELIMINARIES

1. Department Mission

This document contains criteria for promotion and tenure in the History department. These criteria are designed to promote the fulfillment of the Department mission:

History is an encompassing discipline that examines the connection between historical events and human experiences. By studying the causes, contexts, and chronologies of individual events and larger historical developments, history provides an understanding of the nature of continuity and change in human experiences. History also seeks to place contemporary issues, ideas, and relationships in historical perspective. A historical perspective gives a sense of both the chronological ordering of events and the relationship of diverse events at a given moment. It also involves sensitivity to cultural differences and awareness of conflicting interpretations of the same occurrences.

The Department of History serves undergraduate and graduate students, the profession, and society in general. The undergraduate curriculum is designed to provide both majors and nonmajors with (1) an appreciation of the nature and importance of a historical perspective, (2) an understanding of the development of specific peoples and societies, and (3) an awareness of conflicting interpretations of the past. Additional goals for majors at the undergraduate and graduate level include achievement of (1) an understanding of the nature of the discipline of history, and (2) the research, writing, and analytical skills to pursue professional careers or to continue their education in graduate and professional schools. The department also has a strong commitment to the professional development of its faculty through the production of scholarly publications and participation in the programs and offices of professional associations. Finally, the department seeks to serve the community at large through work with local historical and professional organizations, lectures to local groups, and publications focusing on the history of the immediate area. In all these activities the History department seeks to maintain the integrity of history as a scholarly discipline within the liberal arts and to promote the highest professional standards.

Candidates for promotion and tenure are expected to have made important contributions toward achieving this mission and toward meeting the educational needs of the History Department and the University of South Florida, and are expected to continue fulfilling this mission in the future. The History Department recognizes the principles of equity of assignment, resources, and opportunities of faculty across a multi-campus university.

2. College and University Guidelines

In addition to the criteria in this document, candidates should familiarize themselves with the University Tenure and Promotion Guidelines, the College of Arts and Sciences Tenure and Promotion Procedures, and the USF-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement.

3. Department Procedures

1. Application materials: Prior to consideration by the department chair and tenure-and-promotion committee, it is expected that each application for tenure and promotion be complete. A complete application file contains all of the elements in the University's College of Arts and Sciences tenureand-promotion application:

- a. letters from external evaluators, as selected by the department chair and approved by the Dean of the College from a slate of names of referees suggested by the candidate. The referees should normally be tenured faculty members (at the rank of associate or full professor or its equivalent) at universities in the US and elsewhere. They need to be full professors in case of an application to full professor. It is incumbent on the candidate to clarify the nature of the candidate's relationship with each referee, so as to avoid conflict of interest. Dissertation supervisors or personal friends, for example, cannot be considered appropriate referees.
- b. up-to-date CV
- c. narrative components
- d. annual reports as recorded in the university's FAIR system
- e. student-course evaluations
- f. mid-tenure evaluations for candidates for tenure-and-promotion to associate professor
- g. binder with all the forms filled out as required
- h. binder(s) with supplementary materials attesting to the candidate's research, teaching, and service records, including such things as copies of books, articles and other publications, correspondence with journal editors, publishers regarding publications, manuscripts of work not yet published, grant applications or correspondence from granting agencies.

The candidate is expected to supply for the purposes of soliciting **external reviews the department with this package no later than May 1** of the year prior to which s/he expects to be promoted. It is understood that certain changes (such as replacing submitted manuscripts with published versions) to the package may still be made before the eligible members of the department vote on the candidate's application, in the early part of the following Fall Term.

2. Departmental endorsement: Applications for tenure and promotion must be considered within the Department:

- a. by a departmental tenure-and-promotion committee, which is the department's executive committee for tenure-and-promotion cases to associate professor, and by the full complement of the full professors in the department for promotions to full professor. The committee is to issue a written report evaluating the candidate's record in terms of research, teaching and service.
- b. by the department's chair.

The evaluation report by departmental tenure-and-promotion committee is to be conveyed to the eligible voting members of the department before they vote by secret ballot on the candidate's application.

To establish the degree of endorsement by faculty, eligible voting members of the department will meet in a closed session and vote by secret ballot in the early part of the Fall semester of the academic year in which the candidate is to be considered for tenure and promotion. The votes will be counted by the chair of the departmental tenure-and-promotion committee and a second member elected by the committee.

Proxy votes may be cast, but will not be valid if cast after 5PM EDT on the last business day before the session. Proxy votes should be communicated to the chair of the committee and the elected member.

For applications for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor, tenured faculty members at the rank of associate or full professor are considered eligible voting members of the department. For applications for promotion to the rank of full professor, only faculty members of the rank of full professor are considered eligible voting members of the department. In addition to the required tenure status and rank, eligible voting members of the faculty must have at least 49% of a full-time, active appointment in the History department, or be on sabbatical leave with the expectation of returning to the History department with at least 49% of a full-time appointment.

The chair of the departmental tenure-and-promotion committee and the departmental chair, with the assistance of the department's staff, will ensure that their reports and the result of the vote will be entered in the candidate's file before it is sent to the College Dean's Office and that this is done in timely fashion. Regional Chancellors will provide a formal review in promotion and tenure cases for faculty members on branch campuses "prior to a College Dean completing and forwarding a recommendation to the Provost."

II. TENURE AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

1. General Principles

1. Scholarship is a process, not a product. The University aims for a consistent standard of quality against which the performance of all faculty members is evaluated. Given the diversity of scholarly and scientific activities throughout the University, each candidate must be assessed according to the norms and expectations of his/her scholarly discipline. Although such measures are considered in evaluating candidates, scholarly merit in History is not easily quantified through such means as citation counts, acceptance ratios and numerically ranked hierarchies of publication outlet. The best judges of a historian's scholarly impact are in-field academic peers. The views of scholarly peers expressed by readers' reports, external review letters and tenure and promotion committees are essential in assessing the overall quality of a candidate.
2. Demonstrated excellence in research and teaching, together with substantive service, are expected for tenure and promotion to associate professor in the History department.

2. Research

Excellence in research is required for tenure and promotion. The following guidelines define excellence in research, and are consistent with the standards and reasonable expectations for tenure and promotion at History Departments at peer (Research I) universities.

1. Peer-Reviewed Scholarly Monograph

In most subfields of History, the prime scholarly expression is the peer-reviewed research monograph. Historians regard the acceptance and publication of an academic monograph as the primary indicator of continuous scholarly activity. In most cases, achieving excellence requires that, during their tenure-earning years and prior to the time of application for tenure and promotion, candidates in History publish or have “in press” (for definition refer to point 6 below) a peer-reviewed scholarly research monograph (for exceptions, see point 4 below). The preparation of a scholarly monograph itself represents evidence of sustained scholarship on the part of its author but it alone is not sufficient to demonstrate a sustained research agenda.

2. Peer-Reviewed Articles and Book Chapters

In addition to the research monograph, it is expected that during their tenure earning years and by the time of application for tenure and promotion, candidates will have published or have “in press” (for definition, refer to point 6 below) 2 or more peer-reviewed articles or book chapters in highly regarded scholarly venues. These may take the form of either articles in a peer-reviewed history journal (or related scholarly field, where appropriate) or chapters in a peer-reviewed anthology.

3. Additional Research Expectations

In addition to the publications listed above, candidates are expected to show evidence of an ongoing and consistent research agenda. A sustained research agenda in history may include the following activities:

- a. publishing, or having in press, additional peer-reviewed articles or book chapters
- b. publishing, or having in press, a peer-reviewed textbook
- c. publishing, or having in press, a new edition or translation of a major historical work or primary source
- d. publishing, or having in press, substantial critical review essays in major academic journals or prestigious non-academic venues
- e. creating a significant digital humanities project or a portfolio of digital humanities projects
- f. editing a peer-reviewed anthology of historical essays
- g. editing a peer-reviewed collection of primary sources
- h. receiving national or international fellowships, residencies, awards, prizes, and other major honors
- i. regularly delivering papers, selected by a peer-review process, at national or international academic conferences and workshops
- j. participating, by invitation or by a competitive application process, in major scholarly workshops, seminars, colloquia, symposia, and institutes

- k. developing a public history portfolio, composed of museum exhibits, films, community events, presentations, workshops, public lectures, and other relevant projects
- l. delivering archaeological reports
- m. developing a portfolio of publicly engaged scholarship, composed of such items as blog posts, newspaper and magazine articles, editorials, essays, radio interviews, television interviews, podcasts, and other relevant projects
- n. submitting major grant and other funding proposals
- o. other research activities, to be determined at the discretion of the department tenure and promotion committee and external reviewers

4. Alternative to the Scholarly Monograph

While in the majority of subfields of History, the prime scholarly expression is the peer-reviewed scholarly research monograph, some subdisciplines stress article production and other forms of scholarship over the book. For purposes of tenure and promotion recommendations, a research monograph should be considered equivalent to 6-8 peer-reviewed articles or book chapters. Therefore, a candidate without a monograph should publish or have in press 8-10 peer-reviewed articles or book chapters. They are also expected to fulfill the additional research expectations described in point 3.

5. Rate of Publication

While candidates are expected to demonstrate a consistent pattern of peer-reviewed publication and other scholarly activity over the course of the probationary period, it is understood that evidence of scholarly productivity may vary widely from year to year. By its very nature, historical research is extraordinarily time-consuming. Many historians are required to travel to other states or other countries, often for months at a time, in order to conduct research in archives and libraries or undertake fieldwork, such as archaeological digs or oral interviews. For others, conducting historical research requires translating primary sources from foreign or ancient languages, often multiple ones. For these reasons, the research and writing of a scholarly monograph can occupy a candidate's exclusive attention for some time, during which other publications and other forms of scholarly productivity are unlikely to be forthcoming. Publication rates tend to increase and ultimately stabilize as a research program matures. Should total productivity meet expectations at the end of a candidate's tenure-earning years, a lower publication rate at the beginning of that period must be viewed without prejudice. In measuring productivity, evaluators will consider research and teaching assignments and whether scholarly output seems commensurate with these assignments.

6. Definition of "Published" and "In Press"

A book or article is "published" when it is available for everyone to read, either in print or online. A book or article is "in press" when the author has no more editorial work to complete on the accepted project and a letter from the publisher confirms in writing the date of publication. However, a candidate with no published, peer-reviewed work at the time of application cannot be considered as attaining excellence in research.

7. Assessment of Quality

Assessment of research quality in History is a rigorous process, but primarily a qualitative one. The quality of scholarly production in History is to be assessed by professional historians and, for faculty members engaged in interdisciplinary research, by qualified scholars in relevant fields. For purposes of tenure and promotion recommendations, the department chair and tenure and promotion committee should give great weight to the following three indicators of quality:

- a. evaluations by a candidate's external reviewers
- b. the reputation and competitiveness of the venues in which the candidate's work is published (as evidenced by external and internal evaluations and data such as journal or scholarly press acceptance rates)
- c. the public recognition of a candidate's work in the form of prizes, awards, fellowships, and grants (although it is not required for tenure and promotion external funding from prestigious sources is looked upon favorably)

8. Duplicate or Minimally Revised Publications:

Publication of work in multiple outlets in translated form, or with no, little, or some revision will be considered. These publications must be viewed within the candidate's overall record of scholarly productivity, however, and cannot themselves substitute for an otherwise sparse research output.

9. Work Previously Published

Work published prior to the start of the candidate's tenure-earning years provides evidence of longterm scholarly productivity, and will therefore be considered as part of the candidate's overall record of scholarly productivity. However, this is not a substitute for a sustained research agenda during the tenure earning years, as described in points 1-4.

3. Teaching

Excellence in teaching is required for tenure and promotion. The assessment of excellence in teaching occurs primarily at the departmental level, and should draw on documentation generated throughout the candidate's tenure-earning years. The following guidelines define excellence in teaching, and are consistent with the standards and reasonable expectations for tenure and promotion at History departments at peer (Research I) universities.

University teaching and student learning encompass much more than the hours faculty members spend in the classroom. Teaching also involves keeping up with the field, planning lectures, creating instructional materials, constructing tests, grading papers, advising students, participating in tutorials and formal teaching committees, working with graduate students, supervising graduate teaching assistants, conducting office hours, and participating in professional development programs. Because many aspects of teaching remain invisible to students, their evaluations alone are inadequate to provide comprehensive and convergent evidence of teaching effectiveness. In

addition to student assessments, evaluations need to be obtained from individuals who both understand the subject matter and recognize the intellectual effort and pedagogical merit involved in various instructional activities. Thus, the evaluation process should include peer reviews from colleagues who are in a position to compare a particular teaching effort—content, methods, emphasis and so forth—with other possible ones. Classroom visitations are encouraged as part of the peer review process.

Documentation of teaching excellence and peer reviews should evaluate the following, where not every component need be weighted in equal measure for every candidate:

1. Evidence of Curricular Rigor

A candidate's syllabi must meet the highest disciplinary standards of rigor appropriate to the content and level of each course. They should reflect up-to-date knowledge of relevant scholarship, and due consideration of the place of each course in the department and university curriculum. Assignments should comply with disciplinary best practices, particularly with regard to the commitment of academic history to persuasive discursive writing.

2. Evidence of Curricular Innovation and Maintenance

Candidates for tenure may present evidence of their participation in the renewal and maintenance of the history curriculum. Such evidence can include the syllabi for experimental special topics courses, proposals for new courses, documented leadership in the certification or recertification of existing courses for college and university requirements, and participation in the periodic assessment and revision of department degree programs.

3. Reports of Peer Evaluation

The department must maintain evidence that teaching has been carefully evaluated by senior colleagues. Such evaluation may involve peer visitation, exit interviews with students, and sampling of submitted assignments and instructor feedback.

4. Reports of Student Evaluation

During a candidate's tenure-earning years, the department must maintain an archive of student assessments of the candidate's instructional effectiveness. These materials may include written comments from graduate and undergraduate students at all levels, and from graduate teaching assistants the candidate has supervised. Both the narrative and statistical elements of student evaluations generated for each course at the end of every term should also be considered.

5. Evidence of Contribution to the Degree Programs in History

a. Graduate Program

Successful candidates for tenure will have made significant contributions to the graduate program in history, above and beyond having offered graduate courses. Though it is not expected that untenured faculty serve as major professors for Ph.D. students, their contributions might include service on M.A. and Ph.D. comprehensive examination boards or thesis and dissertation committees, and the supervision of directed research by graduate students.

b. Undergraduate Program

Successful candidates for tenure will have made significant contributions to the B.A. program in history. Such contributions may include assuming primary responsibility for required courses, offering the capstone seminar, supervising honors theses or directed research, and participating with undergraduates in clubs or other activities.

6. Evidence of Commitment to Pedagogy

Evidence of commitment to pedagogy may include honors and awards for teaching (both intra- and extra-mural); participation in training sessions, workshops, and conferences devoted to pedagogy in higher education, or in history in particular; contributions to publications on pedagogy; and authoring textbooks, editing primary source collections, or participating in history curriculum development at the local and national levels.

4. Service

Substantive service is required for tenure and promotion. The following guidelines define substantive service, and are consistent with the standards and reasonable expectations for tenure and promotion at History Departments at peer (Research I) universities.

1. Types of Service

Service in the department, University, professional organizations, and the community offer evidence of faculty commitment to the success of their mission as educators. Every tenure-earning member is expected to serve the University of South Florida through participation in committees and bodies that support the mission of the University in educating students and advancing scholarship. A candidate is expected to prioritize research and teaching over service and to seek the guidance of the department chair when considering service responsibilities.

2. Assessment of Service

In assessing contributions in service, evaluators will to some degree consider the candidate's willingness to cooperate in the business of the department, the University, and the profession. Community engagement is also considered. Substantive service requires evidence of such effort as expressed in advising, membership and active participation on committees, book- or manuscript reviews, office holding in professional organizations, speaking to community groups in areas of a

candidate's professional competence, fundraising, and other forms of professional and public outreach.

III. PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

Promotion to the rank of professor requires excellence in research and follows the same set of criteria required for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate professor.

Only Department members of the rank of professor will evaluate and vote on candidates wishing to advance to the rank of professor.

This document may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the department's tenured and tenure-earning faculty. After amendment, it must be approved by the Offices of the Dean and Provost.

This document will be reviewed by the Department in years ending in 0 and 5.

Approved by faculty vote 10/14/2015

Approved by Dean's office 10/20/2015

Approved by Provost on 06/01/2016

Effective 06/01/2017

Approved by Dean and Provost May 8, 2020

Approved by faculty vote 05/15/2020