DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY, POLITICAL SCIENCE AND PHILOSOPHY

Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

Criteria for Faculty in the Disciplines of History, Political Science, and Philosophy Seeking Promotion and/or Tenure

The Department Chair, the first instance of review in the Promotion and Tenure process, will apply the following guidelines in deciding whether or not to recommend the candidate for Promotion and/or Tenure. These are not new guidelines and criteria, but are rather the articulation of criteria already in use by this Department for this purpose. It is our hope that the evaluators above the Department Chair level continue to accept and respect these criteria. It is also our intent to provide new faculty members with more specific and thereby more helpful and accurate criteria as measures of their academic accomplishments as they prepare for the promotion and tenure process.

The criteria presented in these guidelines by no means constitute a formula generating a quantifiable final result. Qualitative rather than quantitative criteria must guide the evaluation process. In stressing the qualitative over the quantitative we recognize and encourage scholarly creativity and defend academic freedom from any sort of "check list" of academic productivity and accomplishments. In order to ensure optimal consideration of all subjective and creative factors, responsibility rests with the candidate to demonstrate in persuasive narrative form whether the particulars of one's performance and productivity in the areas of **teaching, scholarship**, and **service** deserve the qualifiers *effective, outstanding, active* or *significant.* Likewise we believe it is the duty of the reviewers to take these specific explanations into consideration as they weigh the merits of a candidate's accomplishments.

A candidate for promotion and tenure must first consult the USCA guidelines for P&T as found in section 5.6 of the *USCA Faculty Manual*. *The Manual* distinguishes certain subjective summary modifiers or adjectives corresponding to levels of quality of activities in the three traditional areas of evaluation: **teaching, scholarship,** and **service** for promotion and tenure. This Department applies these modifiers to the respective levels of promotion and tenure when evaluating these three main areas of faculty activities. These apply as follows:

Teaching

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, "candidates are expected to offer evidence of *effective* teaching."

For promotion to Full Professor or tenure at the rank of Full Professor, "candidates are expected to offer evidence of *outstanding* teaching."

Scholarship

For promotion to Associate Professor and/or tenure at that rank, candidates are expected to demonstrate *active* or *significant* scholarly/creative/applied professional activities (scholarship) in combination with *active* or *significant* service. (The candidate must demonstrate *significant* performance in at least one of the two areas).

For promotion to Full Professor or tenure at that rank, candidates must offer evidence either of *sustained significant* scholarly/creative/applied professional activities (scholarship) in combination with *active sustained* service, OR *sustained, active* scholarly/creative/applied professional activities (scholarship) in combination with *outstanding* service.

Service

For promotion to Associate Professor or tenure at that rank, candidates are expected to demonstrate *active* or *significant* service in combination with *active* or *significant* scholarly/creative/applied professional activities (scholarship). (The candidate must demonstrate *significant* performance in at least one of the two areas).

For promotion to Full Professor or tenure at that rank, candidates must offer evidence either of *sustained active* service in combination with *sustained, significant* scholarly/creative/applied professional activities (scholarship), OR *outstanding* service in combination with *sustained, active* scholarly/creative/applied professional activities (scholarship).

Modifiers

The faculty of this Department as well as the faculty of USCA in general recognize the individuality of faculty members in terms of creativity and academic interests. Therefore Section IV.4 of the P&T guidelines states that Criteria . . . "must allow for individual uniqueness and creativity in performance and to value differences within and between disciplines. (Faculty members should not be expected to perform alike or to be equally strong in all areas.)" With this section of the P&T policy in mind, we suggest the following definitions and elaborations of the modifiers (*effective, outstanding, active* and *significant*) as they are used to distinguish the quality levels of the three areas of faculty responsibility when evaluating history, political science and philosophy faculty:

Modifiers Related to Teaching:

Candidates as well as evaluators must keep in mind that Teaching is the primary responsibility of the USCA faculty and that the principal area of teaching to be evaluated is the faculty member's performance in conducting his/her courses. *Effective* teaching, which is required for promotion to Associate Professor and/or Tenure at that rank, involves demonstrating that students are offered opportunities to learn, to create and discover in challenging and varied ways. The traits that the candidate must demonstrate as an *effective* teacher are those presented in the USCA P&T guidelines:

- command of subject matter
- familiarity with advances in the field
- using a variety of methods to effectively and logically organize and present material
- active involvement of students in the learning process
- instilling in students an awareness of the general objectives of the discipline
- making the discipline relevant to students' lives and values
- guiding advanced students in creative work
- maintaining high standards of achievement and fairness in grading
- and any other activities that demonstrate commitment to teaching

Outstanding teaching, which is required for promotion to Professor and/or Tenure at that rank, takes *effective* teaching to a higher level. The *outstanding* professor will not only demonstrate all the elements of *effective* teaching, but will also demonstrate the ability to sustain that same *effective* teaching over a longer period of time.

As evidence of achieving these goals and being an *effective* teacher the candidate should provide documentation that verifies meeting these goals and should explain in narrative form how he/she meets these goals. The candidate may include the following (except where required is noted) as evidence of *effective* teaching, though this is not an exhaustive list:

- Standardized evaluations as well as self-designed evaluations
    - Submission of standardized evaluations is required. Written evaluations or self-designed evaluations are optional, but recommended. Student evaluations are a significant component of the review process, but by no means are the sole determinant in evaluating teaching.
- Self-critique of one's teaching is strongly recommended. The critique along with student evaluations and peer observations constitute the most important items in the teaching file. Topics covered in the critique include but are not limited to:
    - Descriptions of new teaching methods and their objective evaluation.
    - Discussion of research activities closely related to course content or to technique, including papers presented and publications.
    - Numbers of course preparations.

    - Regular revision of course content to keep up to date in field or with content.
    - Evaluating success or failure of applying new methods or technology to course.
    - Efforts to enhance interdisciplinary collaboration at USCA.
    - Efforts to internationalize the curriculum.
- Peer observation reports, along with student evaluations and the self-critique carry significant weight in evaluating teaching.
- Letters from former students, especially unsolicited testimonials, are valuable additions to a teaching file.
- New course syllabi and/or other evidence demonstrating course updating.
- Discussion of one's role in directing internships, independent studies, honors theses, and honors courses. The Department especially values collaborative faculty-student projects.
- Discussion of Advisement responsibilities, with added weight given to First Year advisement and advising special groups such as pre-law.
- Developing and presenting new forms and programs of teaching, such as internet courses or distance learning that require extra time and effort will add considerable value to a file.
- Teaching workshops, seminars, and symposia attended. Demonstrating the integration of lessons learned from attending these venues will add value to a file.
- Serving as a guest instructor or lecturer.

As evidence of *outstanding* teaching, which is required for promotion to Professor, the candidate must demonstrate a continuing and sustained effort at maintaining the performance level of an *effective* teacher. One may submit the same evidence offered to verify *effective* teaching, but this evidence must reflect one's *effective* teaching performance extended over a longer period of time. In addition, honors, awards and recognition for teaching excellence and innovation shall add significant value to making a case for an *outstanding* teacher.

Modifiers Related to Scholarly/Creative Activities:

Distinguishing between *active* and *significant* scholarly/creative/applied professional activities is both difficult and problematic. For our disciplines, *active* refers to someone who does some kind of research and writing regularly, presents it in some setting, periodically has some of that work published or used (if it is applied research), and serves as a professional reviewer of others' work as either a panel discussant or reviewer. How often these things are done cannot be precisely specified because that depends on the scope, difficulty, available materials and resources, and time demands of the tasks attempted. Our disciplines often require extensive research over long periods of time in order to prepare even a conference paper, not to mention publishable articles or books. In our fields grants are much scarcer and are usually quite small compared to those in the physical sciences and do not play as great a role in the overall evaluation of one's record. In short, *active* means evidence of on-going work and research and being able to demonstrate these scholarly activities—whether it is writing a grant, gathering

data in the field or in archives, or writing or rewriting for a publication, a book, or an applied project. Some projects might be done quickly, like a book review or journal article review, while others may take years.

Significant scholarly/creative/applied professional activities involve a greater level of activity and/or a higher level of success in presentation, publication and/or application. Various acceptable outlets for publication and presentation exist, ranging from edited journals and books, to texts, peer-reviewed journals and Web based outlets. Some are more demanding than others. Although precisely rating the level of each journal is difficult, peer-reviewed works in scholarly journals and other media rank higher and carry with them a greater value. Other factors such as whether a journal is a top national or international periodical in the field or whether a conference is a major scholarly gathering are considered when evaluating a piece of work. One book written over several years for a well-known press is certainly *significant*, as would be a number of combinations of other activities. Being recognized as a leading scholar in some special field of expertise in the discipline as the result of one's history of work, as evidenced by being invited to make presentations or write pieces about that work, is usually proof of *significant* activity.

In short, the evaluation of *active* refers to the scholarly/creative/applied professional work of someone who is engaged in an ongoing way in these activities, with some success in presenting the results and sharing them with peers. *Significant* scholarly/creative/applied professional activities implies a higher level of success in presenting the results and/or producing works that have a notable impact on the discipline, or on the community in the case of applied research. A critical criterion in evaluating a *significant* scholarly product is acceptance and acknowledgement by peers in the discipline. Generally speaking, the more rigorous the peer review or editing process and the more extensive the research and longer the work, the more it will be valued. The department values both traditional and applied creative and scholarly activities, as illustrated in the list of examples below:

In the area of **scholarship**, the department values the following work (not an exhaustive list) as contributing to *active* scholarship:

- Entries in a reference volume or encyclopedia, though several contributions of this type over time, along with other scholarship, may amount to *significant* scholarship.
- Non-peer-reviewed contributions, although several such contributions over time or contributions to large audiences could amount to *significant* work.
- Editing books and reviewing works under consideration by publishers and journals (both printed and electronic) may be evidence of either *active* or *significant* scholarly activity, depending on the time and energy expended.
- A book review for a journal alone usually reflects *active* scholarship, although several, as is the case with reference entries, could contribute to *significant* scholarship. Being asked to review a particularly important piece of work in a discipline may contribute to a *significant* rating.

- Discussants for panels at academic conferences. The discussant may, however, make a case that this contributes to *significant* scholarship, depending on the amount of work required and the audience of the conference.
- Successfully applied professional activities may be considered as evidence of either *active* or *significant* scholarly work, depending on the nature and amount of work involved.
- Writing discipline-specific grant applications and proposals reflect *active* work, while receiving a grant or devoting an extraordinary amount of time and energy to an unsuccessful effort may be considered evidence of *significant* activity.
- Discipline-specific consulting work is considered evidence of *active* scholarship. However, on-going or repeated consulting work that reflects one's expertise and reputation in the discipline and reflects positively on USCA and the Department may be regarded as *significant*.

In the area of s**cholarship**, the department values the following work (not an exhaustive list) as contributing to *significant* scholarship:

- A book, in particular one researched and written by an individual faculty member and published by a reputable press. Although a book is not required in order to receive promotion or tenure, publishing a book—along with other *active* and *significant* scholarship—would substantially add to one's credentials. Positive book reviews will enhance the value of the book as evidence of *significant* scholarship.
- Other books, including textbooks, shorter monographs, as well as co-authored and edited works, will enhance one's scholarship file.
- Articles in peer-reviewed scholarly journals, both printed and electronic.
- Most papers presented at reputable, scholarly, peer-reviewed conferences will be considered as evidence of *significant* scholarly work. The nature of the conference will have bearing on this evaluation.
- Discipline specific speeches to audiences consisting of professional peers (such as keynote speeches at conferences or special presentations).

No formula specifying precisely the number of scholarly/creative/applied works guarantees an overall evaluation of *significant* work. In our disciplines, due to the nature of research, gathering data, synthesizing and evaluating the material, and finally writing or producing the final result, one can normally expect no more than one piece of work a year that contributes to *significant* scholarship. A combination of several projects that are evidence of *active* scholarship may also amount to *significant* productivity in a given year. It is therefore incumbent upon the candidate to make a case for the importance of a scholarly product by discussing its scope and value in terms of research, methodology, time and effort expended in the process, and the value of the final product to the discipline or scholarship in general. The candidate must also explain the relative importance and nature of the venue in which the scholarly work is presented.

Modifiers Related to Service:

Distinguishing among *active, significant, and outstanding* levels of service involves balancing both quantity and quality:

Active is the rather routine level of service that one performs as a good member of the University and the larger community—serving on a few committees at different levels in the University; occasionally doing some professionally based activities in the community; helping with student organizations; providing service to professional organizations; and/or serving the department.

Significant service combines quality and quantity in the activities listed under *active*, and requires some leadership roles on committees, task forces, etc., and/or occasionally producing policies, recommendations, reports, studies, and programs.

Outstanding service usually involves assuming leadership roles on committees, task forces, etc.; creating, revitalizing and/or promoting policies and programs; implementing policies and programs; leading the community, the University, the department or one's profession in a certain direction based on one's professional skills and/or expertise. The distinction of *outstanding* presupposes major time and energy commitments in an ongoing way. Sustained service over longer periods of time at the *significant* level also constitutes *outstanding* service.

In the area of **service**, the department values service to the USCA campus, to the USC system, to the disciplines in the Department, and to the greater community. Although a record of a number of *significant* contributions will enhance a file, there is no precise formula as to the precise number of active or *significant* contributions that will result in an overall *significant* evaluation. Evaluators, from the Department Chair on up, should view the service record holistically. As in the other areas of faculty activity, it is incumbent upon the candidate to provide evidence for and establish a persuasive case for *significant* or *outstanding* service. Candidates for tenure and promotion must provide a narrative explaining the context for each item of evidence in their respective lists of activities.

For **University Service** the Department values the following work (not an exhaustive list) as contributing to *active* service:

- Membership in the Faculty Assembly and its standing committees and on ad hoc campus-wide committees, including search committees.
- Membership in and administration of campus units and programs.
- Membership on departmental committees or performing department or discipline related functions, such as library coordination, assessment, or scheduling.
- Participating in or being the principal in writing a non-discipline related grant.
- Service to student organizations, though serving as the primary advisor of a particularly active organization may contribute to *significant* service.

- Membership on an active and productive USC Committee constitutes to *significant* service.
- Serving in a part-time administrative capacity may contribute to *active* or even *significant* service.

In the area of University Service, leadership roles on committees and positions of responsibility in the aforementioned activities as well as being the primary producer of major plans, policies or programs within the purview of these activities will add value toward an evaluation of s*ignificant* service. In general, major, time-consuming duties such as editing newsletters and journals, directing labs, coordinating disciplines, and serving on USC System committees also contribute toward *significant* service, as do receiving a grant or devoting an extraordinary amount of time to an unsuccessful effort. Sustained *active* service over a longer period of time may be valued as *significant* service. Awards and special recognition of one's University service usually confirm *significant* service.

In the area of **professional service**, the department values the following discipline-specific work (not an exhaustive list) as contributing to *active* service.

- Holding an active office (president, secretary, treasurer, program chair, editor of newsletter, etc.) in a professional organization.
- Membership in a professional organization.
- Serving on committees of professional organizations.

Leadership roles or particularly active, time and energy consuming tasks such as organizing and chairing sessions at professional meetings, keeping financial records and editing proceedings, journals, etc., for a professional organization may be valued as *significant*. Positive consideration will be given to sustained, *active* service over a longer period of time.

In the area of **community service**, the department values the following work (not an exhaustive list) as contributing to *active* service:

- Providing discipline-specific service to public schools and organizations such as judging academic competitions or doing workshops and presentations for classes or school groups.
- Presentations and speeches to civic groups and organizations such as Life-Long Learning.
- Authoring discipline-specific materials for newspapers and other popular press outlets.
- Giving discipline-specific interviews to the media.
- Membership on community boards, committees, and organizations requiring professional knowledge, such as local historical associations or government planning units.
- Awards and recognition for community service.

In the overall evaluation of the three areas of **service**, leadership roles, organizational work, developing and sustaining programs, drawing, plans, etc., and devoting greater time, research, and/or effort and energy in the aforementioned activities will constitute *significant* service, as may sustained *active* service over a period of time. Important awards may constitute s*ignificant* service. A record of ***sustained***, *significant* service over time constitutes *outstanding* service. Special awards and recognition of service will contribute to distinguishing *outstanding* service, as will leadership positions in major efforts such as, but not limited to, SACS reviews, University planning task forces, and USC system committees.

Departmental advice to candidates for promotion and tenure:

A candidate should consider annual performance evaluations as indicators (although not foolproof) of whether or not she/he is making good progress toward promotion and tenure. Repeated **Unsatisfactory** evaluations in any of the areas of teaching, scholarship and service, will in all probability result in denial and failure. Overall **Satisfactory** evaluations, although acceptable for annual evaluations, may or may not result in a successful candidacy for either tenure or promotion. Satisfactory evaluations reflect either minimal performance, or at the very best, *active* performance. **Meritorious** evaluations usually reflect a *significant* or even *outstanding* level of performance, which in all probability—although they do not absolutely guarantee it—indicate a level of performance that should result in a recommendation for tenure and promotion.