

**WORKLOAD, ANNUAL REVIEW, AND TENURE/PROMOTION GUIDELINES
DEPT. OF HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY**

Last Revised 15 August 2013

Principles of Operation of these Guidelines

1. Given that department T&P guidelines are discipline- and field-specific and are approved by deans and the provost as consistent with college and university standards, department guidelines are understood to be the primary basis for tenure and promotion decisions. In cases when the Chair, Dean, or Provost reverses a tenure or promotion recommendation of the department T&P committee, the rationale for such a reversal shall be stated in a letter to the candidate and the committee and shall make specific and detailed reference to these department T&P guidelines in justifying the decision to reverse the committee's recommendation.
2. Consistent with the University Tenure and Promotion Guidelines, the Department of History and Philosophy accepts the following categories of scholarship: the scholarship of discovery, which builds new knowledge through traditional research; the scholarship of integration, which interprets the use of knowledge across disciplines; the scholarship of application, which aids society and professions in addressing problems; and the scholarship of teaching, which studies teaching models and practices to achieve optimal learning.
3. As indicated in the Faculty Handbook, "these guidelines become effective 12 months following their adoption. However, individual faculty may choose to be reviewed under revised guidelines immediately upon their adoption."

I. FACULTY WORKLOAD

- A. In accordance with college guidelines, the teaching load for most faculty is 3/3. Course reassignments may be negotiated with the chair to accommodate research and service commitments. In accordance with college guidelines, if a course reassignment is granted for scholarship or service, the time and effort spent in those activities should be equivalent to the time and effort that would have been spent in teaching the reassigned course.
- B. In determining workload, each three-hour course counts for 20% of a faculty member's time and effort per semester; hence, the standard teaching load should comprise approximately 60% of the time and effort.
- C. The non-teaching part of faculty workload should equal about 40% of the faculty's time and effort.
- D. In accordance with college guidelines, at least 5% must be devoted to institutional service.
- E. The remaining 35% will be allocated to research and service as determined by faculty

members in consultation with department chair.

II. EVALUATION PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL REVIEW

- A. Faculty Performance Agreements (FPAs) will include a teaching, research and service plan that details proposed activities for the coming year. Assistant professors, in conjunction with the Chair, will indicate how the proposed activities will progress the faculty member toward tenure.
- B. Annual Review Documents (ARDs) should include a list, in accordance with the previous year's FPA, describing the year's activities and accomplishments, their significance, and how they contribute to progress toward tenure, promotion, professional development or advancement. Faculty members must be able to articulate in their ARDs the quality and significance of their achievements in teaching, scholarship and service, employing criteria that are appropriate to the activity in question.
- C. The activities listed on both the FPAs and ARDs must be consistent with the expectations of the various professorial ranks in the Faculty Handbook (3.6, "General Expectations for Faculty Performance in Different Ranks," and included below in Section III.A).

Listed below are types of scholarly and creative activities and possibilities for demonstrating effectiveness in each area. **These lists are meant to be suggestive, rather than comprehensive, and are presented in no particular order.**

Teaching, supervision, and mentoring

- Student ratings of instruction. Inclusion of these metrics is **mandatory**. Courses must have a student response rate of at least 20% to be viewed as valid.

Other evidence of teaching effectiveness might include examples from the list below. Lecturers and senior lecturers must provide examples in at least two of these categories.

- evaluation from faculty colleagues
- provision of syllabi and other relevant course materials
- development of new courses/programs
- advisement of students
- field experiences and directed studies
- receipt of honors and awards by faculty members or students
- participation in workshops, conferences, and programs designed to enhance and improve teaching
- Other evidence of excellence may be provided consistent with the Faculty Handbook, 3.3.A., "Teaching Supervising and Mentoring of Students."

Service to university, field/discipline, and community

- serving on departmental, college, or university committees
- advising student organizations
- special department service responsibilities (maintaining web page, editing newsletter, etc.)

- writing/publishing scholarly book (or exhibit) reviews
- serving as an officer in a professional organization
- major institutional reports (such as NCSS and NCATE)
- giving talks or providing other discipline-based service to community groups
- organizing conferences/symposia/sessions at KSU or for professional organizations
- writing/editing major institutional reports
- receipt of honors/awards recognizing service to the community, the university, or professional organizations
- professional consulting (such as reviewing manuscripts for publishers or serving as an editor at a scholarly journal)
- discipline-oriented interviews with media
- public programs

Research and Creative Activity

- peer-reviewed monographs, articles and book chapters (in paper or electronic form), as well as comparable peer-reviewed products in the department's disciplines and areas of expertise
- presentations at, or organization of, discipline-based or interdisciplinary conferences that indicate sustained and deliberate progress toward published scholarly work
- edited volumes of essays by other scholars
- peer-reviewed exhibits, multi-media projects, historical preservation reports and plans
- documented evidence of research and/or progress toward completion of the above activities, for example book contract or acceptance letter from journal (Note: Reviews of ongoing research by peers, on the internet or otherwise, might be considered as evidence for progress.)
- receipt of honors/awards for scholarship and creative activity

III. TENURE AND PROMOTION FOR TENURE-TRACK AND TENURED FACULTY

A. EXPECTATIONS OF CANDIDATES

Candidates for tenure or promotion should be able to show, through satisfactory evaluations of their ARDs, that they are performing at an appropriate level in all areas, based on the descriptions given for the various professorial ranks in the Faculty Handbook (3.6, "General Expectations for Faculty Performance in Different Ranks"). Specifically:

- "Adapting to the expectations of the academy and of KSU and getting established in one's scholarly work are typically the primary concerns of an assistant professor. A typical pattern of effective and productive scholarly work for the **Assistant Professor** is one which begins modestly in the early years, perhaps with a limited or local significance, and expands in depth, focus, significance, recognition, and productivity" over the course of one's career. An Assistant Professor should be able to demonstrate, on

a yearly basis, evidence of their progress toward the expectations of tenure – the annual reviews of Assistant Professors will be evaluated by the Chair with this consideration in mind.

- “**Associate Professors** make contributions to knowledge as a result of their scholarly work. High quality and significance . . . are the essential criteria for evaluation. The specialty areas, expertise, and professional identities of associate professors should become more advanced, more clearly defined, and more widely recognized as their academic careers progress. Typically, as the faculty member’s roles and contributions grow towards significance, leadership and initiative, the faculty member establishes a strong record of accomplishments with broader impact and recognition within and beyond the University.”
- “**Professors** are experienced and senior members of the faculty members who have become highly accomplished in their scholarly activities. They are faculty whose careers have advanced to mature and high levels of effectiveness and productivity. Professors have strong records of contribution to and leadership in their respective areas of emphasis. A professor is typically characterized as a leader, mentor, scholar, expert, and/or distinguished colleague. Professors make significant contributions to knowledge as a result of their scholarly work, whether demonstrated through the scholarly work of research, teaching, or professional service. Professors have a documented record of distinguished accomplishments using the criteria for quality and significance of scholarly work These accomplishments will merit regional, national, or international attention and recognition. Professors continue to grow and develop in their respective areas of emphasis.”

A series of satisfactory annual reviews alone, however, is not sufficient to warrant tenure or promotion. Evaluation of department faculty will be based on the following three criteria:

- First, because of Kennesaw’s mission to provide “exceptional educational opportunities,” candidates for tenure or promotion must demonstrate highly effective teaching. Acceptable forms of evidence are listed in Section II above. Such a demonstration of effectiveness should take into account the Department’s new mission statement: “Our first mission as faculty of the Department is to provide the highest quality in teaching for each of our majors and general education students. Beyond careful conveyance of salient content, departmental instruction will strongly encourage development in higher-order thinking, meaningful self-reflection, and understanding. Students should emerge from History & Philosophy classes with a deepened understanding of their own culture, as well as the culture and world views of others. They should embrace the importance of life-long learning, possess enhanced written and oral communication skills, and be prepared to serve as able advocates for the betterment of society.”
- Second, candidates for tenure or promotion must show that they have satisfied the minimal institutional service requirement and have demonstrated the potential for on-going and substantive service to the department, university or scholarly community (“... all faculty members are expected to devote at least 5% of their time to professional service activities essential to the life of the institution”-- Faculty Handbook, 3.2).

- Third, candidates for tenure and promotion must demonstrate a record of substantive work demonstrating success in scholarship. A suggestive list of acceptable forms of research and creative activity appears in Section II above. Details concerning the nature and significance of this scholarship appear in Section III.B below.

B. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF SCHOLARSHIP

In the disciplines and areas of expertise represented in the department a variety of criteria may be used to establish the significance of a work of scholarship. The case for the work's significance must be made by the applicant herself or himself, using criteria and methods appropriate for the work in question. The applicant's demonstration of the value of a scholarly work must be articulated in the portfolio narrative and in a manner that is clear to reviewers at the college and university level who are not trained in History or Philosophy.

Means of assessing the significance of scholarship include:

1. Peer-reviewed work. As a general rule, peer-reviewed work is adjudged more highly than non-peer-reviewed work. It is the responsibility of the applicant to indicate the nature of the peer review for each work of scholarship (for example, blind peer-review, peer review, or review by an editor).
2. Available ratings sources for certain types of scholarly work that indicate the quality and selectiveness of the press or journal (for example, journal acceptance rates, citation reports, book reviews, or portfolio reviews).
3. Explicit Discussion/Demonstration of the quality and significance of the scholarly/creative product. These might apply especially to certain regional scholarship, collaborative scholarship and scholarship aimed at a non-specialist audience.

The Department recognizes that some forms of scholarship are not commonly blind peer-reviewed. It is therefore incumbent on faculty members to (a) solicit reviews of their work in a manner that provides objective assessment by recognized professionals in the field, or (b) make the case that the product has been reviewed in a manner comparable to peer-review. It is also incumbent on faculty members to make a case for the significance of their work in creating new knowledge, fostering effective learning environments, or engaging with public audiences in collaborative historical work. Finally, it is the faculty member's responsibility to confirm the chair's concurrence as to the comparability and significance of non-traditional scholarship in the annual reviews for the years leading up to the application for tenure or promotion.

C. EXPECTATIONS FOR PORTFOLIOS

For tenure, faculty members must submit evidence of a professional trajectory that encompasses effective teaching, service to the university and/or the profession, and quality research or creative activity. Moreover, the faculty member must demonstrate the intent and capacity to continue developing professionally in these three areas. Evidence of scholarly accomplishment should include 1) two peer-reviewed articles (either already published or accepted for publication with all stages of review completed) or 2) a book with a reputable scholarly press (either already published or accepted for publication with all stages of review completed) or 3) some combination of a peer-reviewed article, an edited book, an essay in an edited volume, or other peer-reviewed work (either already published or accepted for publication with all stages of review completed). These requirements for scholarship are designed to serve as baseline expectations for consideration for tenure; alone, however, they are insufficient - additional scholarly production of a traditional or non-traditional nature is expected and will be assessed according to the guidelines detailed in Sections III.B above. The Department Tenure and Promotion Committee will be expected to take into account evidence that the trajectory of this scholarly work will result in further significant publications.

For promotion to associate professor, faculty members must submit evidence of professional maturation in teaching, service, and research and creative activity. That is, faculty members seeking promotion to Associate Professor should show evidence of the adoption of sound and effective teaching practices, increased leadership and/or responsibility in professional and university service, and the development of a coherent body of quality research and creative activity. Finally, the faculty member should show the potential for on-going and sustained contributions to teaching, service, and research and creative activity.

For promotion to full professor, the department expects that the faculty member will have a documented record of significant accomplishments in teaching, service, and scholarship. In teaching and service, it is expected that a full professor will have assumed a leadership role in the activities and programs of the Department and University. In the area of scholarship, a full professor should have at least one book or six peer-reviewed articles in publication (or a comparable combination of books, articles, essays in edited volumes, edited books, or other peer-reviewed work); **a substantial amount of this scholarship should have been produced since the promotion to the rank of associate professor.** These expectations serve as a baseline requirement; additional scholarly production of a “traditional” or “non-traditional” nature is expected and will be assessed according to the guidelines detailed in Sections III.B above. Finally, the faculty member should show evidence of on-going, sustained and likely significant future contributions to teaching, service, and research and creative activity.

Tenure and promotion guidelines as applied to History Education faculty must reflect policy Board of Regents Policy: “USG institutions will support and reward faculty who participate in significant and approved efforts to improve teaching and learning in K-13 schools, including teacher preparation, through decisions in promotion and tenure, pre-tenure and post-tenure review, annual review and merit pay, workload, recognition, allocation of resources, and other rewards.” (Board of Regents Policy Manual 8.3.15.1) This policy also applies to “faculty who

participate in significant efforts to improve teaching and learning in USG institutions.” (Board of Regents Policy Manual 8.3.15.2) It is the expectation of the department that History Education faculty will meet the publication minimums outlined for History faculty above.

IV. NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

A. LECTURERS AND SENIOR LECTURERS

Lecturers and senior lecturers in the Department of History and Philosophy are not eligible for tenure and are appointed on a year-by-year basis. Yearly reappointment depends on recommendation of the Chair to the Dean. Lecturers and senior lecturers have as their primary area of responsibility the teaching, supervising and mentorship of students. The teaching load for lecturers is customarily 5/4, consisting of multiple sections of the same undergraduate courses. The expectations for service are lower than for tenure-track faculty, but lecturers and senior lecturers are expected to attend department meetings and may serve on department and college committees open to non-tenure-track faculty. Lecturers and senior lecturers may assume additional service commitments, with corresponding course reassignments, in consultation with the Chair. There are no expectations in the area of scholarship for lecturers and senior lecturers.

Lecturers and senior lecturers are subject to the same process of FPA and ARD that is described above for tenure-track faculty, including a third-year review. After five years of continuous service, a lecturer will either be promoted to senior lecturer during the sixth year of service or relieved of service at the institution.

B. PROMOTION FROM LECTURER TO SENIOR LECTURER

Review for promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer customarily occurs after the fifth year of service as a lecturer. In keeping with their responsibilities described above in Section IV.A, promotion is based on performance in the areas of **teaching** and **service**. The criteria for assessment in these two areas are the same as those described above for tenure-track faculty, while recognizing that lecturers teach a narrower range of courses. Lecturers must provide two sorts of evidence of teaching effectiveness taken from the list in Section II above, in addition to student ratings of instruction. The narrative and supporting material in the portfolios for promotion to senior lecturer should reflect these emphases.

C. CLINICAL FACULTY

Clinical faculty are educator-practitioners who have a background in their disciplinary area and who practice the discipline in a work setting. Typically, clinical faculty have made substantial, practical contributions in education, public history or related institutions, and have the terminal degree in their discipline. Clinical faculty in the Department of History and Philosophy are not eligible for tenure and are appointed on a year-by-year basis. Clinical faculty are subject to the same process of FPA and ARD that is described above for tenure-track faculty, including a third-

year review. Clinical faculty at the rank of Assistant Professor will also be also required to submit a portfolio for sixth year review if they do not submit a portfolio for promotion.

D. PROMOTION OF CLINICAL FACULTY

As stated in the *KSU Faculty Handbook*, clinical faculty are eligible to apply for promotion. The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia (Academic and Student Affairs Handbook, 4.5) requires a minimum of four full academic years of service at KSU at the rank of assistant professor to be eligible for promotion to the rank of associate professor and five full academic years at the rank of associate professor to be eligible for promotion to the rank of professor.

For promotion to the rank of Clinical Associate Professor faculty members must submit evidence of professional maturation in teaching, service, and research and creative activity. That is, faculty members seeking promotion to Associate Professor should show evidence of the adoption of sound and effective teaching practices, increased leadership and/or responsibility in professional and university service, and the development of a coherent body of quality research and creative activity.

For promotion to the rank of Clinical Professor, the department expects that the faculty member will have a documented record of significant accomplishments in teaching, service, and scholarship. In teaching and service, it is expected that a full professor will have assumed a leadership role in the activities and programs of the Department and University. In the area of scholarship, a full professor should have at least one book or six peer-reviewed articles in publication (or a comparable combination of books, articles, essays in edited volumes, edited books, or other peer-reviewed work); a substantial amount of this scholarship should have been produced since the promotion to the rank of associate professor. These expectations serve as a baseline requirement; additional scholarly production of a “traditional” or “non-traditional” nature is expected and will be assessed according to the guidelines detailed in Sections III.B above. Finally, the faculty member should show evidence of on-going, sustained and likely significant future contributions to teaching, service, and research and creative activity.

V. REVISION OF THESE GUIDELINES

1. Amendments to these Guidelines must be circulated at least one week in advance of the first of two readings at consecutive department faculty meetings and approved by a two-thirds majority of the Voting Members at the second meeting. Voting will be by secret ballot.
2. There will be no voting by proxy. Mail and e-mail ballots will be accepted, provided they have been received by the Chair of the Elections Committee at least half an hour before the beginning of the meeting. If, however, the proposed amendment is changed significantly at the second reading, no mail or email votes will be counted.

Approved by the Department Faculty on 30 April 2013, updated references endorsed on 15 August 2013.

Shirley K. Pate 16 Jan 2014
Department Chair Date

Robert H. Hoff 1/16/14
Dean, College of Humanities and Social Sciences Date

Mike Kline 1/16/14
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs Date