CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY:
APPOINTMENT, ANNUAL EVALUATION, THIRD YEAR REVIEW
TENURE AND PROMOTION
The Department of History
The Dorothy F. Schmidt College of Arts and Letters
Florida Atlantic University

Adopted April 11, 1997. Revised Fall 1998, Spring 2001, Spring 2002, Fall 2003,
Fall 2006, Fall 2009, Spring 2010, Fall 2010, Spring 2016, Spring 2018, Spring 2021, April 19, 2021
Approved by Provost, Spring 2021

Table of Contents:

I. DEPARTMENT MISSION STATEMENT

A. The Department of History is committed to excellence in teaching, production of original scholarship and creative work, and service to the department, college, university, academic profession and wider community. History faculty members publish scholarly books, articles, essays and book reviews; they present papers at national and international conferences and edit scholarly journals. They are teachers committed to increasing the knowledge and skills of their students, and they support the wider programs of the university by their commitment to service and governance. These criteria remain consistent across the department yet are met somewhat differently depending on a faculty member's assignment and area of specialization. They engage in academic outreach that brings scholarly expertise to the public sphere through such activities as involvement in continuing education programs, participating in media interviews, and giving public lectures and presentations, writing for periodicals, blogs, or websites. Those with expertise in public history engage in public programming, curate exhibits or supervise student internships at museums and historical societies

The History Department offers the B.A. and M.A. degrees. The department contributes significantly to the University's core curriculum as well as to interdisciplinary certificate undergraduate programs in the College. In its upper-division classes, the department offers specialized courses for majors and minors and for other interested students. Most upper division courses are writing intensive. All successful history majors produce lengthy research papers based on extensive analysis of primary sources in two required capstone courses (Historical Methods HIS 3150 and Senior Seminar HIS 4935). Our graduate curriculum offers a wide variety of graduate seminars that represent a diversity of interests. All successful MA students either produce a 75-100 page MA thesis based on extensive primary source/archival research, or produce several article length research papers based on

primary sources in 18 hours of research seminar work. Serious and sustained efforts are made to place our graduate students in Ph.D. programs and other appropriate professional programs relating to the study of History.

II. PROCEDURES OF APPOINTMENT FOR HISTORY FACULTY

A. Search Process

1. When it is determined that a new faculty appointment shall be made in History, the department shall meet and determine, by majority vote, the general outlines of the position description for the appointment.

2. After the faculty determines the field and area of specialization of the position to be filled, the chair shall appoint a search committee of not fewer than three members. The chair serves as an ex officio member of the committee. Whenever possible, the composition of the search committee shall reflect the expertise of acuity in the proposed subject area as well as the diversity of the faculty as a whole.

3. All faculty searches shall be conducted in accordance with policies of The D.F. Schmidt College and Florida Atlantic University and with accepted Affirmative Action/ Equal Opportunity principles.

4. The search committee shall propose to the department faculty a list of those to be invited for on-campus interviews. Only those candidates approved by a majority of the members voting shall be invited for on-campus interviews.

5. Following on-campus interviews and after securing necessary approvals from the Office of Equal Opportunity, the search committee shall present its recommendations for appointment to the History faculty for approval. In order to vote, faculty must have attended at least one of the interviewees' presentations (classroom lecture or research presentation to faculty) and be present to vote. In order to be recommended to the Dean for appointment, a candidate must receive the support of at least two- thirds of the department members voting.

B. Determination of Rank and Tenure Status

1. Recommendation of rank for a new faculty appointee must be agreed to by a majority of the department members voting. The same criteria shall apply for appointment to any rank as apply to promotion to that rank, as described in Section IV.A, below.

2. Recommendation to award tenure to a new faculty appointee must be agreed to by a majority of tenured faculty members voting, in accordance with criteria described in Section III, below.

C. Mentoring of Untenured Faculty Appointees

1. The Department Faculty Evaluation Committee (see III.A.1 , below) shall meet with each new untenured faculty appointee within one month of the beginning of the faculty member's appointment, to discuss with the appointee the department's criteria and procedures for promotion and tenure, and to answer any questions the appointee may have.

2. Per college policy, untenured faculty members will have an internal departmental mentor prior to third year review, and an external mentor after third year review.

3. The Faculty Evaluation Committee will meet with faculty members who will be undergoing Third Year Review, tenure and promotion. (For third year review, the meeting will take place in the fall semester prior to the review; for tenure and promotion cases, at the very beginning of the year they intend to submit portfolios) After reviewing the faculty member's updated vita and annual evaluations, the Faculty Evaluation Committee shall meet with the faculty member under review to provide guidance in assembly of portfolios and to discuss issues relevant to the upcoming review and submission of portfolios. In this meeting, the candidate shall be invited to discuss with the committee any consideration, which he or she feels may need special explanation or may not otherwise be adequately addressed in the review process.

4. Each year, untenured faculty will undergo peer evaluation of his/her teaching. The tenured peer evaluator is selected by the department chair in consultation with the candidate. The evaluator notifies the candidate well in advance of his/her visitation to the class that the evaluation will take place. The candidate will give the evaluator pertinent class materials (course syllabus, handouts, etc.) to the evaluator prior to the visitation.

5. After the visitation, the evaluator writes the evaluation based on his/her class visitation and review of class materials. He/she meets with the candidate to discuss the evaluation. A copy of the evaluation is placed in the candidate's personnel file

III. PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS

A. Department Promotion and Tenure Committees

1. The Faculty Evaluation Committee focuses on matters pertaining to mentoring of untenured faculty members, annual evaluation, third year review, and promotion and tenure. It is advisory to the chair of the Department. It shall consist of five tenured faculty members:
   a. The department chair
   b. The committee chair: a full professor elected by tenured and tenure track members of the department; (unit chairs or directors cannot serve) The FEC chair will serve as department representative to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee, and will also chair the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the Department Promotion to Professor Committee
   c. In addition to the Department Chair and the Committee chair, three other tenured faculty members; one must be a full professor. .
2. The Department Promotion and Tenure Committee will convene to consider applications for promotion and tenure. Members include all tenured associate and full professors in the unit. The chair of this committee will be the FEC chair, a full professor elected by tenured and tenure-track members of the department.
3. The Department Promotion to Professor Committee will convene to consider applications for promotion to the rank of full professor. Members include all full professors in the unit. When there are fewer than three Professors in the unit, then the chair or director of the unit will consult with the candidate and Professors in the Department to identify an appropriate external committee member. The invitation to serve on the committee must be approved by the external committee member's chair or director. The chair of this committee will be the FEC chair, a full professor elected by tenured and tenure-track members of the department.

B. Annual Evaluations

1. Consistent with Florida Atlantic University policies and the BOT/UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement, each year the department chair shall be responsible for completing a written appraisal of each faculty member's performance during the preceding year. Faculty members in the department of History are evaluated in terms of three general categories: (A) teaching; (B) research and creative activity, and (C) service.

   The Chair will evaluate all faculty members. The chair may consult with FEC in the process of annual evaluation of untenured faculty members. Chairs are required to offer to discuss the annual evaluation with the tenure-earning faculty member before it is signed and forwarded to the Dean. Evaluation categories include the following:

   Exceptional
   Outstanding
   Good
   Needs improvement
   Unsatisfactory:

2. Please see Section V for specific criteria for faculty evaluation.

3. Consistent with university policies, a faculty member's annual evaluations must be considered in evaluating progress toward promotion and/or (if appropriate) toward tenure. However, all achievements utilized for these annual evaluations will be examined and re-assessed at the time of candidacy for promotion and/or tenure.

C. Appraisal of Progress toward Tenure

1. Consistent with Florida Atlantic University policies and the BOT/UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement, each year the department chair, in consultation with the department's Faculty Evaluation Committee shall be responsible for completing a recommendation concerning each untenured faculty member's progress toward tenure.

2. This evaluation shall be discussed with, and signed by, the faculty member being evaluated before being forwarded to the Dean.

D. Third Year Review

1. A faculty member appointed without tenure shall, in the year set by College policy (normally during the spring semester of the contractual third year)–be formally reviewed by the department Faculty Evaluation Committee for the purpose of evaluating that member's progress toward tenure in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. This review will be done as described in the letter of appointment for those granted years towards tenure.

2. This review shall be in addition to the nominal annual review by the chair in that year, and is advisory to the chair in evaluating the member's progress toward tenure. This review will not result in a vote by the tenured faculty of the department; rather, its primary purpose shall be to provide the faculty member with an evaluation of progress made and constructive advice as to areas in need of improvement, if any.

3. The faculty member under review shall submit a portfolio to the chair of the department

Faculty Evaluation Committee. The date will be established in accordance with the College Promotion and Tenure Committee's timeframe.

4. The Third Year Review-the portfolio must follow **the exact format** as specified in current university guidelines and include everything required in the University's Promotion and Tenure Portfolio Guidelines **except** for letters of reference. It will include the following:

   a. a curriculum vitae that follows the format on the Provost's website: https://www.fau.edu/provost/faculty/files/cv_template_2015.pdf

   b. copies of book contacts and/or letters from journal editors for published and forthcoming works.

   c. For creative activity the section will describe the status of the work, (e.g., completed, in progress) and its significance to the discipline and professional development of the faculty member.

   n.b.: Candidates are responsible for presenting a "clean" dossier that adheres to department, college and university guidelines for third year review. 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.

5. After reviewing the portfolio, the Faculty Evaluation Committee shall submit a report to the department chair which evaluates the faculty member's performance in each of the three areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. The committee's report shall include a summary assessment of the progress the faculty member is making toward tenure. In accordance with college guidelines, the chair and faculty member must sign the account, indicating that they have received it. A copy of this report shall be provided to the faculty member under review and signed by the faculty member and chair. The report shall be made available to those holding tenure in the Department of History in The Schmidt College.

6. The chair shall write a letter evaluating the candidate's progress toward tenure, considering the candidate's record, the departmental evaluation, and the relevant criteria. In accordance with college guidelines, the faculty member may respond to the report within 5 business days of receipt of the report and include the response in the portfolio. The Third Year Review portfolio (which will now include the committee's and chair's letters) will be forwarded to the college P&T committee. The third year review report will be distributed to tenured faculty members in the department.

IV. 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 Promotion and Tenure Committee, composed as described in Section III.A.3, 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 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 provost’s template: https://www.fau.edu/provost/faculty/files/cv_template_2015.pdf .

   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.

c. In the preparation of their portfolios, candidates are required to number all pages in the upper right-hand corner with each prescribed section being in the form 1.1, 1.2, 1.3…2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and so on with the date of the submission of that document to the portfolio inserted directly under the page number. In this way, new supporting documents can be inserted without interrupting the page order or necessitating major revisions of the portfolio, and this will help to ascertain that no documents are missing or out of order.

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. The candidate will submit the portfolio to the department chair and the FEC chair, who will then meet with the candidate to go over any necessary changes to make sure that the portfolio conforms to criteria for submission. The candidate will have 3-5 days after the meeting to make revisions as necessary. The candidate will then submit the portfolio to the chair, who will make it available to tenured members of the department for their perusal and review for 10 business days.

6. The chair shall then convene the members of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee 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 have read the portfolio and are present for the discussion may vote on a tenure application.

   b. All discussion and 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.

9. Following the tenured faculty's vote, and consistent with university and college policies, the chair of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee shall write an account of the deliberations in a letter that accurately reflects the discussion of the case without revealing individuals' positions. This letter will remain part of the portfolio until it reaches the university level. Subsequently, 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. In accordance with college guidelines, the letters from the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee and the chair

will be given to the candidate who will have 5 business days to respond. After this, the chair shall then transmit the entire dossier to the Dean for further levels of review, following the timetable established by the provost.

V. 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.

1. Student Evaluation obtained through the University Student Perception of Teaching Form. In 2015, The University Faculty Senate approved item 6 (Rate the quality of instruction as it contributed to your learning for the course) for the Teaching and Evaluation table in the P&T portfolio.[1] Candidates must also include the SPOT summary sheets for each course taught during the period under consideration**. The Chair will tabulate the responses to question 6 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.***

2. **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 Exceptional, Outstanding, Good, Needs Improvement, or Unsatisfactory. Since teaching assignments, efforts, and achievements will vary from instructor to instructor, this rating cannot be determined formulaically.

3. **Chair's Assessment of Other Contributing Factors[2]:**

---

[1] From Fall 2005 to Fall 2015, question 20 (overall rating of the instructor) was used, as stipulated in the University's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

[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.

a. Creation of new courses or significant revision of existing courses.
b. Creation of programs, workshops, or symposia related to teaching.
c. Mentoring students conducting undergraduate research projects, including honor's theses, directed independent studies, etc., and assisting with submissions to the *FAURJ* and participation in conferences and symposia.
d. Mentoring students conducting graduate research projects, including Master's theses, PhD dissertations, directed independent studies, etc., and assisting with submissions to scholarly journals and participation in conferences and symposia.
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

Exceptional: The rating of Exceptional reflects the highest level of performance in SPOT scores and most of the areas under categories 2 and 3 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 a rating of Exceptional in teaching, the statistical mean on the SPOT evaluations (on question 6 as stipulated in the University's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines) will typically between 1.00 and 1.20 in all courses taught during the period under evaluation.

Outstanding: The rating of Outstanding reflects a high level of performance in most of the areas cited. To receive an Outstanding in teaching ordinarily the statistical mean on the SPOT evaluations (on question 6 as stipulated in the University's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines) in all courses during the period of evaluation will be above the college mean.

Good: The rating of Good reflects an acceptable level of performance in most areas cited. To receive a Good rating in teaching, the statistical mean on the SPOT evaluations (on question 6 as stipulated in the University's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines) in all courses during the period of evaluation will be at or slightly below the college mean.

Needs Improvement: The rating of Needs Improvement reflects less than adequate performance in most areas cited. To receive a Needs Improvement rating in teaching ordinarily the statistical mean on the SPOT evaluations (on question 6 as stipulated in the University's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines) in all courses during the period of evaluation will be consistently below the college mean.

Unsatisfactory: The rating of Unsatisfactory reflects less than adequate performance in all areas cited. To receive an Unsatisfactory rating in teaching ordinarily the statistical mean on the SPOT evaluations (on question 6 as stipulated in the University's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines) will be consistently well below the college mean)..

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 with a major academic or university press that appears in print during the year under review

2. a. Formal acknowledgement from the publisher of scholarly book that all editorial matters are complete and that manuscript will soon enter the production process.
   b. Publication of refereed edited works, textbooks and anthologies
   c. Publication of peer reviewed annotated and edited translations of lengthy primary source manuscripts
   d. Publication of peer reviewed books that involve extensive editing and preparation of unpublished archival sources (this incorporates codicology, paleography, and determination of the provenance of the various manuscripts)
   e. Publication of peer reviewed journal articles, evaluated on basis of scholarship in print or electronic form
   f. Publication of peer reviewed book chapters or articles in edited collections in print or electronic form
   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 peer review is a significant part of the involvement
   i. Published digital histories
   j. Museum exhibits, films, and historic sites (such as exhibit design, educational program design)
   k. Historic preservation, as for instance site survey reports, documenting and preserving sites

3.
   a. Editing of journals and/or other scholarly publications
   b. Creation of bibliographies and databases for use by other scholars
   c. Peer reviewed encyclopedia and dictionary entries, evaluated on their merits with attention to their contribution to scholarship in print or electronic form
   d. Receipt of advance book contract
   e. Papers published in conference proceedings
   f. Book reviews in refereed academic 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 print
b. In press: books and/or articles and chapters that have been completed but are still in press are taken by the department as evidence of significant research/creative activity
c. Acknowledgement by press that manuscript has been successfully completed: documentation of successful completion and acceptance of the manuscript (via letter or email) is taken by the department as evidence of professional activity, but this does not carry the weight of publications that are in print or in press.
d. Under review: Works under review (when candidates can document the successful completion of the manuscript) 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.
e. Under advance contract: Works under advance contract are taken by the department as evidence of professional activity, but they do not carry the weight of works cited above.
f. 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 a-e above

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

Exceptional: a single authored 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

Outstanding: a record of continued publication, including three from category 3 during the current year

Good: a record of continued publication; including two from category 3 during the current year

Needs Improvement: no scholarly activity for current year, and one from category 3 during the preceding three years

Unsatisfactory: no scholarly activity for the current year and one from category 3 during preceding five years

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:

Exceptional: a faculty member makes an active, substantial, and consistent contribution to university service, including a leadership role, such as chairing a committee, or other labor-intensive assignment), and engages in extraordinary professional and community service

Outstanding 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

Good: a faculty member makes a contribution to university service; *or* a faculty member makes a meaningful contribution to professional *and* community service

Needs Improvement: minimal professional, community or university service (demonstrable service in one area and none in the other two)

Unsatisfactory- no service

VI. 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 5 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.

   The Faculty Evaluation Committee will meet faculty members who intend to go up for promotion and the beginning of the calendar year when they will be submitting portfolios. In this meeting, the candidate shall be invited to discuss with the committee any consideration, which he or she feels may need special explanation or may not otherwise be adequately addressed in the review process.

   --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, chapters in books in print or electronic form, and peer reviewed public programming. 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 V. 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 IV. 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.

Department of History
Criteria for Annual Evaluation and Promotion of Instructors
Approved by Office of the Provost January 2013, Updated spring 2016

Objective: To provide a practical and equitable process to recognize and validate the significant contributions of Instructors, reward teaching excellence, and encourage professional development. While years of service are one criterion for eligibility, promotion will be based on various measures teaching excellence and not the number of years in the position.

Purpose: In the interests of assuring accountability and to reward excellent teaching, the department takes it evaluation of instructors very seriously since they often teach a large number of the students we serve. Through the following process the department expects and rewards a commitment to excellence in all realms of teaching and instruction.

I. Annual Evaluation of Instructors

Instructors' teaching will be assessed and documented in three ways: Student Evaluation; Peer Evaluation; Chair Evaluation.

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.

1. **Student Evaluation** obtained through the University Student Perception of Teaching Form.

In 2015, The University Faculty Senate approved item 6 (Rate the quality of instruction as it contributed to your learning for the course) for the Teaching and Evaluation table in the P&T portfolio.[3] Candidates must also include the SPOT summary sheets for each course taught during the period under consideration**.** The Chair will tabulate the responses to 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.

2. **Peer (faculty) Evaluation for Faculty**

a. Peer (faculty) Evaluation for instructors 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 instructors will involve the annual submission of syllabi and other appropriate teaching materials to the Faculty Evaluation Committee for review and response. Instructors 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, and Unsatisfactory. Since teaching assignments, efforts, and achievements will vary from instructor to instructor, this rating cannot be determined formulaically.

[3] **From Fall 2005 to Fall 2015, question 20 (overall rating of the instructor) was used, as stipulated in the University's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.**

3. **Chair's Assessment of Other Contributing Factors[4]:**

a. Creation of new courses or significant revision of existing courses
b. Creation of programs, workshops, or symposia related to teaching
c. Teaching awards or professional recognition for teaching.
d. Publications of teaching materials, presentations related to teaching.
e. Participation in pedagogy workshops.
f. Unsolicited commentaries of students, faculty and other pertinent information in possession of the chair.

4. Overall Evaluation of Teaching

Exceptional: The rating of Exceptional reflects the highest level of performance in SPOT scores and most of the areas under categories 1, 2 and 3 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 Exceptional in teaching, ordinarily the statistical mean on the SPOT evaluations (on question 6 as stipulated in the University's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines; on question 20 prior to 2015) will typically between 1.00 and 1.20 in all courses taught during the period under evaluation

Outstanding: The rating of Outstanding 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 Outstanding in teaching ordinarily the statistical mean on the SPOT evaluations (on question 6 as stipulated in the University's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines on question 20 prior to 2015) in all courses during the period of evaluation will be consistently above the college mean

> A rating of Outstanding reflects an outstanding level of achievement in assigned instruction as evidenced by extraordinary instructional outcomes or a combination of strong instructional outcomes and extraordinary commitment to formal instructional improvement. The faculty member performs beyond the expectations of the assignment.

Good: The rating of Good reflects the solid level of performance in most of the areas under category 2, as well as the consideration of peer evaluations. To receive a Good rating in teaching ordinarily the statistical mean on the SPOT evaluations (on question 6 as stipulated in the University's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines; on question 20 prior to 2015) in all courses during the period of evaluation will be at or slightly below the college mean.

> A rating of Good reflects demonstrable achievement in assigned instruction as evidenced by strong instructional outcomes or a combination of good instructional outcomes and strong commitment to formal instructional improvement. The faculty member performs at or above the expectations of the assignment.

Needs Improvement : The rating of Needs Improvement reflects less than adequate performance in most areas cited. To receive a Needs Improvement rating in teaching ordinarily the statistical mean on the SPOT evaluations (on question 6 as stipulated in the University's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines; on question 20 prior to 2015) in all courses during the period of evaluation will be consistently below the college mean

> A rating of Needs Improvement reflects weak performance in assigned instruction. The faculty member does not meet the expectations of the assignment.

[4] 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.

Unsatisfactory: The rating of Unsatisfactory reflects less than adequate performance in most areas cited for the current year and the preceding year. To receive an Unsatisfactory rating in teaching ordinarily the statistical mean on the SPOT evaluations (on question 6 as stipulated in the University's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines; on question 20 prior to 2015) will be consistently well below the college mean).

A rating of Unsatisfactory reflects weak performance in assigned instruction. The faculty member does not meet the expectations of the assignment for the current year and the preceding year.

II. Promotion of Instructors:

Promotion to Senior Instructor:

Eligibility:

Instructors must be on regular, full-time appointments to be considered for promotion.

Candidates will be eligible to apply for promotion to Senior Instructor at the beginning of their 6th year of full time continuous service or thereafter.

Instructors at any rank are not required to apply for promotion.

Candidates for promotion to Senior Instructor must demonstrate a consistent record of excellence in assigned duties. Evidence of excellence will be measured through careful consideration of:

1. Annual evaluations of teaching (through annual report)
2. Student evaluations of teaching (through SPOT)
3. Annual Peer evaluations of teaching
4. Examples of successful student learning outcomes, demonstration of leadership and rigor in teaching
5. Annual review of syllabi demonstrating familiarity with current scholarship and incorporating it into course readings and overall content

Note: Additional contributions to the department/school, college, or university may be included in the promotion application along with any pedagogical publications, professional presentations, discipline publications, or the application of pedagogical theory through classroom innovations.

Promotion to University Instructor:

Candidates for promotion to University Instructor must first attain promotion to Senior Instructor. Additionally, consistency of teaching success, evidence of teaching quality enhancement, and leadership contributions to the university and the profession are expected. Promotion to University Instructor carries an expectation of notably consistent, increasingly high levels of performance in area(s) of assignment.

Promotion Portfolio:

A teaching portfolio should be submitted reflecting continued development of content and methodology in one's own area of expertise as well as fostering initiatives that advance and disseminate pedagogies. Syllabi included in the portfolio should reflect current scholarship, along with effective teaching techniques and assignments that produce desired learning outcomes.

A candidate whose record indicates difficulty in teaching must document the steps that have been taken to address these difficulties, and the record must reflect, through student evaluations, peer evaluations and teaching enhancement activities, that improvement has occurred.

The portfolio submitted by the candidate should include following materials ONLY (in order):

1. Letter of intent
2. Recommendation letter from Department Faculty Evaluation Committee Chair
3. Recommendation letter from the Department Chair
2. SPOT summary pages for each course taught while within current rank (up to the last 5 years)
3. At least two peer evaluations of classroom teaching
4. Syllabi of all courses taught while within current rank (up to the last 5 years)
5. Any publications related to teaching
6. Any teaching awards or honors

Promotion Timetable

Candidates for promotion will present a letter of intent along with two copies of their portfolios to the Department Chair by January 15th of the year for which they wish to be considered. The Department Faculty Evaluation Committee will meet to review applicant qualifications and make a recommendation to the Department Chair which will be conveyed through a letter from the Committee Chair by February 15th. All tenured and tenure-track members and university instructors in the department will then review applicant materials and vote by secret ballot on their candidacy. Successful candidates for promotion must receive approval of at least a 3/4 of these faculty members. Promotions will go into effect the next semester in which the instructor is teaching.

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*