Promotion and Tenure Policies: History Department
Revision approved by department vote, 26 May 2011

These guidelines outline the criteria for promotion and tenure in the Department of History. They provide a specific departmental context within the general university framework for promotion and tenure of faculty. The guidelines that apply to the candidate’s promotion file are generally those in force at the time of hire or at the time of the most recent promotion.

I. Scholarship, Teaching, and Service: Guidelines

The History Department values excellence in both scholarship and teaching. Excellence in one dimension alone will not be sufficient to guarantee tenure or promotion. The History Department’s policy is to hire people whom we expect to be strong candidates for tenure and promotion and provide them an environment conducive to the accomplishments we expect of them.

This statement represents the standards and expectations of the History Department. Since the tenure and promotion process also involves the College of Arts and Sciences and Provost’s Office and their respective committees, candidates should familiarize themselves with relevant statements of College and University policy, including the "Guide to Promotion and Tenure at the University of Oregon," available on the web at: http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/promotion-tenure-guide.

A. Scholarship

Since History is an AAU doctoral research department, committees give special attention to the activities and achievements of the candidate as a scholar. Normally, excellence in research is measured by her or his publication record. The candidate’s personal statement should describe the development, future direction, and significance of a coherent scholarly program.

In general, the History Department expects a candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor to have either a published book or a completed manuscript that has been accepted for publication at a reputable press. Candidates for promotion should understand that Academic Affairs requires that a book manuscript be “in production” in order for it to count towards promotion. “In production” means that all work on the manuscript by the author, including all revisions up to but not including copyediting, must be complete. This requirement represents the normal standard for promotion in History.

In particular cases, the department may find it appropriate to set an equivalent to this standard that takes a different form. For example, individual scholarly profiles may
lead to a pattern of publishing substantial articles rather than books. In other cases, in subfields of the discipline where the publication of scholarly articles is the prevalent and accepted practice, a number of substantial articles may fulfill this requirement. While there is no set rule for the number of articles someone pursuing this course should have in print or forthcoming, it is unlikely that fewer than six to eight would be viewed as a scholarly equivalent to a book in print or accepted for publication. Generally, books and articles should appear in highly regarded and peer-reviewed outlets. Academic Affairs requires that articles and book chapters must either be “in print” or “forthcoming” in order to count towards a faculty member’s publications. "Forthcoming" means that an article or book chapter has been accepted for publication and requires no further revisions other than copy-editing. A letter to this effect from a journal editor or editor of a volume of essays for each “forthcoming” publication is recommended.

Generally, in order for publications to be counted fully toward promotion, it is expected that books should be “in production” and that each listed article or book chapter should be “forthcoming” by the time the candidate meets with the Dean.

Electronic publication may be an appropriate form for historical scholarship, but candidates should take care that their publication venues follow the same criteria of peer review and evaluation as traditional academic books and journals. Electronic publication is an emerging and rapidly changing area and will therefore require periodic re-examination for its impact on tenure and promotion standards. Candidates can expect electronic publications to be included in tenure and promotion reviews so long as the venues and evaluation procedures follow the same criteria as traditional publications such as journal articles and books. (Electronic work that appears in e-journals, for example, may already have undergone conventional peer review, whereas electronic work that appears in the form of an independent website may not.) The following guidelines are particularly relevant for the review of scholarship in digital forms:

1. Peer Review: As with all scholarship, peer review is crucial. We expect reviewers of electronic publication to review those publications in the medium for which they were produced. (For example, web-based projects should be examined online rather than in printed form.) We expect reviewers to systematically compare that work with other scholarship in the field in order to assess its originality and creativity, just as we would expect for traditional publications. Because digital history is still quite new, however, special care should be devoted to the selection of appropriate reviewers. Appropriate reviewers will be knowledgeable about the range and current direction of electronic publications, as well as traditional publications, in whatever field is under consideration.

2. Permanence: Reviews of electronic publications should offer information about the visibility and durability of the venue in which electronic scholarship appears.
3. Candidates for tenure and promotion may, at their discretion, submit a brief, written explanation of how their electronic work compares to traditional scholarship in their field.

In any case, publications must make significant contributions to scholarship in the judgment of outside referees in the candidate’s field (see "Procedures," below) and of tenured faculty in the department. Thus, quality counts as well as quantity. Indications of scholarly productivity beyond the initial book or portfolio of articles are important. Candidates should at least be prepared to discuss their ongoing research projects and future plans.

For promotion from Associate to full Professor, the department expects the candidate to have either a second published book or a second completed manuscript accepted for publication by a reputable press, or the equivalent as described in the preceding paragraphs. Again, quality counts as well as quantity.

Other factors may contribute to demonstrating excellence in research. They include professional standing and impact on the scholarly field, as demonstrated by the evaluations of external reviewers, awards, membership on boards of journals and professional organizations, and the like; external grant funding; conference attendance and presentations; and other activities that are signs of professional regard, including editorial activities and providing promotion reviews for other institutions. None of these individual elements is required, nor is any particular constellation of them, but any or all may contribute to demonstrating an individual’s pattern of scholarly excellence.

B. Teaching

The History Department values excellence in teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Moreover, the department expects in most cases that tenured (and in many cases untenured) faculty will share department responsibilities for large introductory courses as well as more specialized, upper-division classes. In assessing teaching quality, the department relies on a variety of sources, including numerical data compiled from student course evaluations, signed comments on student evaluations, and classroom visits by colleagues before and during the process of consideration for tenure and/or promotion. Academic Affairs requires that assistant professors have at least one course evaluated by a faculty peer visit during each of the three years preceding her or his promotion and tenure review. UO Senate legislation, as well as Academic Affairs, requires tenured faculty members with the rank of associate professor to have at least one course evaluated by a faculty peer every other year until promotion to full professor. It is the department’s responsibility to arrange these peer teaching evaluations. The department expects that faculty at all ranks will bear an appropriate share of responsibility for supervising undergraduate theses and serving on graduate student exam and dissertation committees. Meritorious service in these capacities may be considered part of a pattern of
excellence in teaching.

Documentation of activities is important: candidates should keep copies of syllabi and other course materials used. Teaching materials developed in electronic form should also be included in the teaching file and, whenever possible, should be evaluated in the medium for which they were produced. The university recommends that candidates for promotion and tenure submit a teaching vita representing a comprehensive record of their teaching activities as well as a teaching portfolio that illustrates teaching scholarship and instructional effectiveness.

Untenured faculty must bear in mind that even impressive dedication and excellence in teaching alone is no substitute for developing a successful program of scholarly research and publication.

C. Service

1. Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor: The department expects its untenured members to participate responsibly and cooperatively when called upon for service within the department. But service counts significantly less in consideration for tenure than either teaching or scholarship. The department will not penalize any untenured faculty member for declining to serve on committees outside the department. Although untenured faculty members may find it appropriate to serve on one or another college- or university-wide committee, the department recommends that they should undertake such duties only on a limited basis and only after consultation with the department head. Service to the profession is also evaluated favorably, but in this case as well, service counts significantly less in consideration for tenure than either teaching or scholarship.

2. Promotion from Associate to full Professor: In the case of promotion from Associate to full Professor, service is weighted more heavily. The candidate should normally have made important contributions to the department, college and university. Significant service to the profession will also be evaluated favorably as an indication that the faculty member has the esteem of her or his professional peers. The relative weight accorded to these two kinds of service will vary from case to case. Community service in one’s capacity as a historian may also be taken into account.

II. Procedures

The University’s promotion and tenure procedures are described on the Academic Affairs website: http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/promotion-tenure-guide. Below are specific procedures for the Department of History and a summary of procedures used in the College- and University-level reviews.
A. Annual Reviews and Contract Renewal

Each Assistant Professor will be reviewed annually by the Department Head. These annual reviews provide an opportunity to evaluate whether the faculty member is progressing towards a favorable tenure decision and offer an opportunity to address any problems in a timely fashion. In the middle of the tenure and promotion period, typically in the third year for faculty members who do not have prior credit towards tenure, the faculty member will undergo a contract renewal. The contract renewal is a thorough review that involves a departmental personnel committee report, a departmental vote, a review by the Department Head, and approval by the Dean. A fully satisfactory review indicating that the faculty member is on track towards promotion and tenure will lead to a contract extension up through the tenure and promotion year. If the contract renewal process determines that the faculty member’s record is not satisfactory and that promotion and tenure are not likely, the faculty member will be given a one-year, terminal contract. A faculty member may also be given a renewable contract that does not extend to the promotion and tenure year if there are questions as to whether the faculty member will have a record meriting promotion at the end of the tenure and promotion period. In such cases, the faculty member will be required to go through another contract renewal process prior to the promotion and tenure review in order to determine if the faculty member has been able to remedy the shortcomings in the record identified in the contract renewal process.

B. Review Period

A candidate is normally reviewed for tenure and promotion in the sixth full-time equivalent year of service. An accelerated review can occur in an unusually meritorious case or when prior service at another institution has led to a contractual agreement to this effect at the time of hire. The terms of hire should make clear where on the timeline an individual faculty member stands; from that time on, subsequent advances in rank will be awarded according to established promotion procedures. In cases in which credit for prior service at another institution is agreed upon, scholarly work completed by the faculty member during those years will receive full consideration during the tenure and promotion process. Should a faculty member who has agreed to an accelerated review at the time of hire choose to delay that review for the full six years of full time service, scholarly work completed prior to arrival at the University of Oregon will be of secondary consideration during the tenure and promotion process. Consideration of scholarly achievement will focus on work completed during the six full time years of service at the University of Oregon. The University also has Parental Leave/Pregnancy and Medical Leave policies that can affect the timing of promotion by “stopping the tenure clock” for a pre-specified and contractual period of time. Faculty members considering such leaves should consult the Academic Affairs website: http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/. Faculty members should discuss the timing of leave and its relation to the promotion and tenure decision with the
Department Head who may also consult with the Dean and the Provost to ensure that there is appropriate and clear written documentation of leave agreements.

C. External Reviewers

In the spring term prior to the year when the tenure case is to be considered, the Department Head will consult with members of the department and, when appropriate, members of any research institute/center with which the faculty member is affiliated, and prepare a list of external referees who will be invited to evaluate the research record of the candidate. Subsequently, the candidate will be asked to submit a list of potential external referees to the Department Head. These processes must be independent. External reviewers should generally be from comparable or more highly regarded institutions. Ideally, they should be Full Professors who have the appropriate expertise to evaluate the candidate’s record. Generally, dissertation advisors, close personal friends, or other individuals who might be viewed as having a conflict of interest, are not asked to be external reviewers. The University requires that a clear majority of the reviewers come from the department’s list of recommended reviewers; there must be at least five letters in the submitted file. If the department’s list of recommended external referees overlaps with the candidate’s list of recommended external referees, these referees’ names will count as department-recommended reviewers. External reviewers are generally asked to submit their letters by late September or early October.

D. Internal Reviewers

The department may also solicit on-campus letters from those familiar with the candidate’s teaching, scholarship or service. In particular, inclusion of an internal review is the norm when a faculty member is a member of a research institute/center. This review is prepared by the Director of the institute/center, in consultation with its senior members.

E. Candidate’s Statement

The candidate is required to prepare a personal statement in the spring term prior to tenure and promotion consideration. The statement should describe the candidate’s scholarly accomplishments, agenda, and future plans. The Office of Academic Affairs indicates that a five-page, single-spaced statement is ordinarily sufficient. The candidate’s personal statement also should include a section describing his or her teaching program, indicating courses taught, pedagogical objectives and methods, and any past, present, or future course development activity. It should also contain a discussion of service activities for the department, the college, the university, the profession, and the community. The personal statement should be accessible to several audiences, including external reviewers, fellow department members, other university colleagues, and administrators. Thus, the personal statement should strike a balance between communicating with experts in the field and those who are not members of the discipline and who may not be familiar with
the candidate’s area of research. Candidates are encouraged to seek advice on their personal statements from tenured colleagues.

**F. Dossier**

During fall of the tenure-decision year, the department will prepare the candidate’s dossier, which must include, in addition to at least five letters from external reviewers, the following materials: (1) a signed and dated current curriculum vitae (note: the c.v. should distinguish clearly among written work that is submitted, “forthcoming” or published; it should indicate the length of all writing listed; and it should indicate which journals or books are refereed); (2) copies of all significant publications; “forthcoming” work may also be included (an unpublished work may be described on the c.v. as “forthcoming” if it has been accepted; there must be written affirmation, which may be via email, from the editor of a press for a book, an editor of a journal for an article, or a book editor for a book chapter, as to the full acceptance of a contribution and a statement that all requested revisions have been submitted and that the work in question is no longer subject to authorial or editorial change other than copyediting); works in progress may be included as the candidate chooses; (3) a signed and dated candidate’s statement; (4) a signed copy of the waiver or non-waiver letter; (5) a list of courses taught by term and year, with numbers of students and numerical evaluation scores provided to the department by the Registrar; (6) syllabi and other course materials; (7) a list of all Ph.D., M.A., and undergraduate honors theses, with an indication of whether the candidate was the committee chair or a committee member; (8) signed student comments; (9) peer evaluations; (10) a list of all materials sent to outside evaluators; (11) biographies of external reviewers and a description of any known relationship between the candidate and the reviewers.

Candidates should be sure to submit updated information to the Department Head as to the ongoing status of all submitted publications and work in progress (acceptance, forthcoming, and appearance, with the necessary documentation) throughout the promotion and tenure process; the Department Head should notify the CAS Associate Dean with responsibility for Promotion and Tenure as that information becomes available.

**G. Promotion and Tenure Committee and Report**

During the spring term, and prior to the deadline by which the tenure case must be submitted, the Department Head will appoint a promotion and tenure committee of tenured faculty to review the candidate. If there is an insufficient number of tenured faculty in the department to constitute a personnel committee, the Department Head should select committee members from tenured faculty in other related departments with guidance from the Dean and the appropriate Associate Dean. This committee will be charged with submitting a written report to the department evaluating the candidate’s case for promotion. In particular, the committee report will include an internal assessment of the candidate’s work, a summary and evaluation of the external and internal referees’ assessment of the candidate’s work, an evaluation of teaching that includes a discussion of
the numerical student evaluation scores, written comments, and peer reviews, and an assessment of department, university, professional, and community service. The committee report must conclude with a recommendation to the department regarding tenure and promotion. The committee report is generally made available in the department office to all tenured faculty of appropriate rank for review prior to the department meeting. In most departments, both Associate and Full Professors vote in tenure and promotion cases, but only Full Professors vote for promotion from Associate to Full Professor.

H. Department Meeting and Vote

In general, the Department will hold a meeting in mid- to late October to consider its promotion and tenure recommendation for the candidate. Voting members meet and discuss the committee report and the case. Following discussion, members vote by signed, secret ballot on whether to recommend tenure and promotion (or just promotion in the case of a promotion to Full Professor). When all votes have been registered, the votes will be tallied, usually by the Department Head, and the department will be informed of the final vote tally. The anonymity of the individual votes will be maintained, although the signed ballots will be kept in a signed and sealed envelope by the Department Head in case they are requested by the Dean or the Provost. The Department Head does not vote.

I. Department Head’s Review

After the department vote, the Department Head writes a separate statement. The statement includes a description of the process, including any unique characteristics of the profession (e.g., books versus articles; extent of co-authorship; significance of order of names on publications, etc.). The statement also offers an opinion regarding the case for promotion and tenure that may or may not agree with the department vote. The Department Head’s statement, the personnel committee report, the recorded vote, and the materials submitted by the candidate are added to the dossier. The completed file is then sent to the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS). The deadline for submission of the file to CAS is generally in the middle of November for tenure cases and late November for Full Professor cases.

J. Degree of Candidate Access to File

The candidate must submit a signed waiver letter in the spring term prior to the file being sent to external reviewers. The candidate can waive access fully, partially waive access, or retain full access to the file. The candidate should consult the Academic Affairs website http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/ for a complete description of the waiver options. The candidate may request a written summary of the Dean’s review after the meeting with the Dean, even if the candidate has fully waived his or her access to the file.

K. College and University Procedures
1. Once the file leaves the department, it goes to the Dean’s Advisory Committee (DAC), which is comprised of two faculty from each of the three divisions within CAS (Sciences, Social Sciences, and Humanities). If a member of the candidate’s department is serving on this committee, s/he is recused from discussion and voting. The DAC reads the file and writes a report evaluating the candidate’s research, teaching, and service. The DAC votes on whether the candidate should be promoted and, if appropriate, receive tenure. The vote is a recommendation to the Dean.

2. After the file leaves the DAC, the Dean receives the file and writes a letter evaluating the research, teaching, and service record of the candidate based on the contents of the file. This letter indicates whether the Dean supports or does not support promotion and/or tenure. After the letter is completed, the candidate is invited to the Dean’s office for a meeting. In the meeting, the Dean indicates whether or not he or she is supporting promotion, reads a redacted version of his or her evaluation letter, and answers any questions with regard to the position taken on promotion and tenure. In most cases, the Dean will meet with the candidate in the months of January, February, or March.

3. After the file leaves the College of Arts and Science (CAS), it goes to the Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC), a ten-person committee including CAS and professional school faculty members (if a member of the candidate’s department is serving on this committee, he/she is recused from discussion and voting). The FPC also reads the file and writes a report evaluating the candidate’s research, teaching, and service. The FPC votes on whether the candidate should be promoted and, if appropriate, receive tenure.

4. Once the FPC has completed its deliberations, the file goes to the Provost’s office. The Provost ultimately makes the promotion and tenure decision and all earlier deliberations, reports, and votes in the file are advisory to him or her. The Provost reads the file and writes a brief letter describing his or her position with regard to promotion and/or tenure. If the promotion and tenure decision is a difficult one, the Provost may in rare cases invite the candidate for a meeting. The Provost’s decision with regard to promotion and tenure is communicated by letter in campus mail. Except in rare and difficult cases, the Provost has agreed to provide a decision in campus mail on May 1st (or before May 1st if it falls on a weekend). In other cases, the candidate will receive the letter on or before June 15th.