Department of History, Anthropology, and Philosophy Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

OVERVIEW

These Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for the Department of History, Anthropology, and Philosophy ("departmental guidelines" hereafter) are intended to foster excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service among the faculty. These guidelines do not supersede, but supplement and further elaborate on the *Pamplin College Promotion and Tenure Guidelines* ("college guidelines" hereafter) and Augusta University's *University Guidelines for Faculty Promotion and Tenure* ("university guidelines" hereafter).

While it is incumbent on the candidate to demonstrate excellence in all areas of his/her professional responsibilities, it is the responsibility of the college and the candidate's department to maintain a robust course of faculty development and assessment which, starting from the date of hire, assists the candidate in understanding what is expected for promotion/tenure, assessing his/her progress in fulfilling those expectations, and if necessary, developing an appropriate plan of improvement prior to requesting promotion/tenure.

In fulfillment of that responsibility, the Department provides all tenure-track faculty with timely and frequent opportunities to assess their progress. These include the assignment of a faculty mentor, regular annual reviews, regular peer evaluations of teaching, a comprehensive third-year review of the candidate's progress toward tenure, and the establishment of clear expectations for the award of promotion/tenure as outlined in these and the college guidelines. Support continues after tenure through regular annual reviews and peer evaluations of teaching, as well as a comprehensive post-tenure review every five years. Full-time, non-tenure track faculty receive similar forms of support.

Purpose of this Document

The purpose of this document is to explain how the college guidelines for promotion/tenure are applied within the Department, including any departmental or discipline-specific procedures or criteria for assessment. This document only addresses the most pertinent, departmental-level criteria for promotion/tenure of full-time, tenure-track faculty. Candidates should also consult the college guidelines for a more complete understanding of the process, including extension due to a FMLA qualifying event (which must be filed within three months), and college-wide expectations for promotion/tenure. Guidelines for the review and promotion of Lecturers are in Appendix 3 of the college guidelines.

Additional topics and information may be found in the college guidelines, the university guidelines, the BOR Policy Manual, and the USG Academic & Student Affairs Handbook, all of which may be accessed from the Resources page of the Pamplin website at www.augusta.edu/pamplin/resources.php.

GENERAL CRITERIA AND EXPECTATIONS

To be recommended for promotion/tenure, the candidate must demonstrate all of the following:

- Appropriate credentials and experience as specified in the college guidelines. Credit toward promotion/tenure shall only be awarded if it was specified in the candidate's contract at the time of his/her hire or last promotion.

- Outstanding achievement in teaching, as demonstrated in the promotion/tenure portfolio.

- Outstanding achievement in scholarship, as demonstrated in the promotion/tenure portfolio.

- Satisfactory ("meets the standards") achievement in service, as demonstrated in the promotion/tenure portfolio.

Additionally, requests for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor or higher must be supported by three letters from external reviewers.

College-wide expectations for each of these topics may be found in the college guidelines. Departmental and discipline-specific criteria are described in the sections that follow.

Teaching Expectations

Teaching refers to the best practices and responsibilities required to be an effective educator, advisor, and mentor. These include: (a) knowledge of the subject matter, (b) effective planning and communication of curriculum, (c) supervision of students, (d) creation of engaging learning environments, (e) fostering of student development and engagement, (f) availability and receptivity to students, (g) fair and timely evaluation of student performance, (h) student advisement, and (i) innovation in educational delivery.

See the college guidelines for college-wide expectations for outstanding teaching. Departmental and discipline-specific expectations for outstanding teaching are described below. Note that teaching expectations are the same for all disciplines in the Department.

Teaching will be evaluated in two categories. Category 1 criteria centers on performance in the classroom. Category 2 measures teaching efforts outside the classroom as well as efforts to improve one's teaching abilities. Section 1 criteria are standard for the Department whereas Section 2 varies by teaching load.

Teaching Category 1: Proficiency in Classroom Teaching

Regardless of reported effort for teaching, all candidates for promotion/tenure must demonstrate proficiency in classroom teaching as follows:

1. Mastery of course subject matter.

2. Teaching effectiveness demonstrated by peer evaluations of teaching.

3. Teaching effectiveness demonstrated by student evaluations.

4. Teaching effectiveness demonstrated by regular use and review of assessments of student learning outcomes.

Teaching Category 2: Engagement in Pedagogical Development, Curriculum Development, and Teaching Outside of the Classroom

All candidates for promotion/tenure are expected to have engaged in work outside the classroom related to curriculum development, mentoring, student-centered research, and pedagogical development and innovation, which may entail any combination of the following:

1. Proposing and having accepted a significant and innovative change to the existing curriculum

2. Teaching honors, leadership, and INQR 1000 courses

3. Proposing and having accepted into the catalog new courses

4. Publication of a textbook

5. Organization of teaching workshops at Augusta University

6. Significant involvement and/or participation in multiple events sponsored by the Office of Faculty Development and Teaching Excellence

7. Recognition of teaching excellence (nominations and/or awards for pedagogical excellence and/or student mentoring)

8. Act as mentor on honor's theses, capstone projects, or other research projects broadly defined; students must either be primary authors or contribute significantly and substantially

9. Internship coordination including advisement on and placement in internship sites; also administration of, and community outreach to this effect, which could include developing relationships and MOUs with new internship partners

10. Act as supervisor for three or more directed or independent study courses

11. Effective use, development, or integration of technology for innovative teaching and learning

12. Acquisition of continued education in teaching field by attending teaching conferences or workshops outside of Augusta University

13. Other significant teaching activities which have been approved by the department chair

Expectations for outstanding achievement in Category 2 vary in proportion to the candidate's reported effort for teaching as described in the following table:

Objective	Reported Effort for Teaching	Teaching Expectations (Department-wide)
Tenure/promotion to Associate Professor or to Professor	80% (4/4)	Demonstrate proficiency in classroom teaching per all criteria in Category 1 above. Fulfill a total of 3 to 4 different criteria from Category 2 above, in any combination, since the last promotion.
	60% (3/3)	Demonstrate proficiency in classroom teaching per all criteria in Category 1 above. Fulfill a total of 2 to 3 different criteria from Category 2 above, in any combination, since the last promotion.
	40% (2/2)	Demonstrate proficiency in classroom teaching per all criteria in Category 1 above. Fulfill a total of 1 to 2 different criteria from Category 2 above, in any combination, since the last promotion.

Scholarship Expectations

Scholarship refers to scholarship and research endeavors appropriate to the candidate's discipline. In evaluating scholarship for promotion/tenure, primary consideration is given to dissemination of the individual's scholarly work; however, consideration will be given to other forms of scholarship, especially in fields where publication of scholarly work is not a mainstream method of dissemination.

See the college guidelines for college-wide expectations for outstanding scholarship. Department and discipline-specific expectations for outstanding scholarship are described below. Note that scholarship expectations differ for each discipline in the Department and therefore are subdivided by discipline below.

All faculty, regardless of discipline, must show evidence of outstanding achievement through peer-reviewed publication and other scholarly activity. Scholarly production will be evaluated in terms of quantity, as listed in the disciplinary criteria below. Scholarly production will additionally be evaluated in terms of quality, through both an internal and external review.

If the candidate's reported effort for scholarship changes, the yearly expectation for scholarly productivity shall be adjusted accordingly. Additionally, if the candidate has reassigned teaching time due to increased service requirements or official or unofficial administrative duties, expectations for scholarly productivity shall not increase because teaching load has decreased. For example, if a candidate has a 3/3 teaching load due to administrative duties and/or involvement in special projects on campus, their scholarship requirement does not increase.

For those coming to Augusta University with probationary credit, scholarly work done at previous institutions will be taken into account, but the applicant must present evidence of continued exemplary scholarship since joining this Department. Items accepted for publication prior to the candidate's hire or last promotion shall not count toward the minimum departmental expectations for scholarly publication/production unless such credit was specified in the candidate's contract at that time.

All publications should be published in the appropriate discipline, broadly interpreted. The Department Chair shall resolve any questions regarding the appropriateness of a project (e.g. a textbook, a translation, or interdisciplinary work).

Expectations for Scholarship in *History*

The Department of History, Anthropology, and Philosophy in conjunction with the discipline of history believes firmly in the dissemination of new knowledge through publication and scholarly presentations on this new knowledge. Grants and other monetary awards for travel associated with conference and research can also be included as evidence of scholarly achievement, although not without a record of publication. The acquisition of new knowledge is based on original, often archival, research.

Candidates from the discipline of History are expected to demonstrate a persistent scholarly presence with a trajectory of scholarly engagement appropriate to his/her rank and reported effort for scholarship.

Examples of persistent scholarly presence include (but are not limited to): peer-editing or serving as a peer-reviewer for publications, publication of book reviews, publication in non-peer reviewed journals, community & public lectures, receiving funded internal grants, submission of substantial external grants, and editing a journal or book.

The basic units of review are a peer-reviewed article and a peer-reviewed national presentation. Equivalencies for publications are listed in Appendix A. Equivalencies for presentations are listed in Appendix B. These units are weighed against other types of publications and presentations as more or less than the basic units of one. For example, a peer-reviewed monograph with a top-level press (high-impact factor press) such as Harvard or Oxford would have the equivalent value of 7 peer-reviewed articles. The same is true of presentations. A local presentation to the library is worth far less than a researched presentation given at a national conference. A national keynote address would be equivalent to 3 peer-reviewed national (podium) presentations.

Expectations for outstanding achievement in scholarship vary in proportion to the candidate's reported effort for scholarship as described in the following table:

Objective	Reported Effort for Scholarship	Scholarship Expectations (History)
Tenure/promotion to Associate Professor	10% (4/4)	At least 0.2 publication and 0.4 presentation per year, at a regional level or higher.
	30% (3/3)	At least 0.6 publication and 0.8 presentation per year, at a regional level or higher.
	50% (2/2)	At least 1 publication and 1.2 presentations per year, at a regional level or higher.
Promotion to Professor	10% (4/4)	At least 0.2 publication and 0.4 presentation per year, at a national level or higher.
	30% (3/3)	At least 0.6 publication and 0.8 presentation per year, at a national level or higher.

	50% (2/2)	At least 1 publication and 1.2 presentations per year, at a national level or higher.

If the candidate's effort for scholarship changes, the yearly expectation for scholarly productivity shall be adjusted accordingly. At the time of review for promotion/tenure, the minimum criteria for outstanding scholarship shall be determined by totaling the number of publications and presentations expected for the candidate's reported effort for each year under review.

Assuming the level of reported effort for scholarship remains constant, the candidate should be on pace to fulfill the following expectations:

Reported Effort for Scholarship	Pre-Tenure Review (By the start of Year 4)	Tenure/Promotion to Associate Professor (By start of Year 6)	Promotion to Professor (By start of Year 12)
10% (4/4)	0.6 publication and 1.2 presentations	1 publication and 2 presentations	2.2 publications and 4.4 presentations
30% (3/3)	1.8 publications and 2.4 presentations	3 publications and 4 presentations	6.6 publications and 8.8 presentations
50% (2/2)	3 publications and 3.6 presentations	5 publications and 6 presentations	11 publications and 13.2 presentations

Expectations for Scholarship in *Anthropology*

Scholarship in anthropology is usually based on combinations of field research (in the US or abroad), lab research, and library or archival research. The combinations will be project-specific and, on rare occasion, will entail only one of the three elements. Field research in anthropology can be a hit-or-miss endeavor. An archaeologist or physical anthropologist may run a full field excavation season to discover no useful data for publication or presentation while a cultural anthropologist may do preliminary field research only to find that authorities in the locale s/he wishes to work will not allow the study or local people are unwilling to cooperate. Furthermore, anthropological research projects often involve multiple phases—background library/archival research, collecting field data, and a data analysis phase that might involve several years of lab analysis or transcribing interviews. Many granting agencies require anthropologists to have completed preliminary data gathering in order to justify a grant for a larger, perhaps long-term, project. In short, anthropological research can be a slow process that requires research before an outside grant can be obtained.

For candidates from the discipline of anthropology, scholarship is evaluated according to a combination of persistent scholarly presence and a record of research that includes publication and grant application/awards. Category 1 establishes criteria for productivity in the form of publication and/or grants within the candidate's discipline. Category 2 establishes criteria for maintaining a persistent scholarly presence.

Scholarship Category 1: Publications and/or Grants

Candidates for promotion/tenure are expected to demonstrate productivity in publication/grants through any combination of the following:

1. Publication of peer-reviewed journal articles, including those of a pedagogical nature and open access journals. The primary criteria for inclusion here is that the scholarship has been peer-reviewed. The committee, when appropriate, can weight publications in prestigious journals with high impact factors higher.
2. Publication of a book by a reputable academic press, excluding textbooks.
3. Editing/Co-editing an academic book in anthropology or a related discipline.
4. Publication of a peer-reviewed chapter in an academic book.
5. Principal investigator of an externally funded grant for the discipline.

The departmental committee will weight books (i.e. monograph or edited volume), journal articles, book chapters, and grants using the equivalency guidelines in Appendix A. A single book *may be* viewed as fulfilling the entire Category 1 requirement if it is of sufficient length and published by a reputable academic press.

Scholarship Category 2: Persistent Scholarly Presence

Candidates for promotion/tenure are expected to demonstrate a persistent scholarly presence through any combination of the following activities:

1. Refereed state/regional, national, or international scholarly presentation. Multiple presentations at the same conference are counted individually.
2. Peer-editing or serving as peer-reviewer for publications.
3. Publication of book reviews for a peer reviewed journal in appropriate discipline.
4. Publication in non-peer reviewed journals.
5. Invited research lectures (invited by peers).
6. Substantially funded internal grant.
7. Submission of substantial external grant applications.
8. Substantial contribution to grants for which the candidate is not a principal investigator.
9. Publication of data sets.
10. Applied research (class related or not) or assistance in writing grants, offered pro bono to public and/or nonprofit organizations in our area.

At the time of review for promotion/tenure, the minimum criteria for outstanding scholarship shall be determined by totaling the number of publications and presentations expected for the candidate's reported effort for each year under review, going back to the initial appointment as Assistant Professor. If at the time of initial appointment the candidate was awarded probationary credit, or if the candidate was initially appointed as an Associate Professor, the expectations shall be modified as appropriate.

Expectations for outstanding achievement in Category 1 and Category 2 vary in proportion to the candidate's reported effort for scholarship, as described in the following table:

Objective	Reported Effort for Scholarship	Scholarship Expectations (Anthropology)
Tenure/promotion to Associate Professor	10% (4/4)	Fulfill one criterion from Category 1 <u>and</u> two criteria from Category 2 above, in any combination.
	30% (3/3)	Fulfill three criteria from Category 1 <u>and</u> four criteria from Category 2 above, in any combination.
	50% (2/2)	Fulfill five criteria from Category 1 <u>and</u> six criteria from Category 2 above, in any combination.
Promotion to Professor	10% (4/4)	Fulfill two criteria from Category 1 <u>and</u> four criteria from Category 2 above, in any combination.
	30% (3/3)	Fulfill six criteria from Category 1 <u>and</u> eight criteria from Category 2 above, in any combination.
	50% (2/2)	Fulfill eleven criteria from Category 1 <u>and</u> thirteen criteria from Category 2 above, in any combination.

Expectations for Scholarship in *Philosophy*

For candidates from the discipline of Philosophy, scholarship is evaluated according to two categories. Category 1 establishes criteria for productivity in the form of publication and/or grants within the candidate's discipline. Category 2 establishes criteria for maintaining a persistent scholarly presence.

Scholarship Category 1: Publications and/or Grants

Candidates for promotion/tenure are expected to demonstrate productivity in publication/grants through any combination of the following:

1. Publication of peer-reviewed journal articles, including those of a pedagogical nature and open access journals. The primary criteria for inclusion here is that the scholarship has been peer-reviewed. The committee, when appropriate, can weight publications in prestigious journals with high impact factors higher.

2. Publication of a book by a reputable academic press, excluding textbooks.

3. Editing/Co-editing an academic book in philosophy or a related discipline.

4. Publication of a peer-reviewed chapter in an academic book.

5. Principal investigator of an externally funded grant for the discipline.

The departmental committee will weight books (i.e. monograph or edited volume), journal articles, book chapters, and grants using the equivalency guidelines in Appendix A. A single book *may be* viewed as fulfilling the Category 1 requirement if it is of sufficient length and it was published with a reputable academic press.

Scholarship Category 2: Persistent Scholarly Presence

Candidates for promotion/tenure are expected to demonstrate a persistent scholarly presence through any combination of the following activities:

1. Refereed state/regional, national, or international scholarly presentation. Multiple presentations at the same conference are counted individually.

2. Peer-editing or serving as peer-reviewer for publications.

3. Publication of book reviews for a peer reviewed journal in appropriate discipline.

4. Publication in non-peer reviewed journals.

5. Invited scholarly lectures/presentations (invited by peers).

6. Substantially funded internal grant.

7. Submission of substantial external grant applications.

8. Substantial contribution to grants for which the candidate is not a principal investigator.

9. Scholarship or research award recipient, e.g., Fulbright Scholarship, NEH funding or summer seminar/workshop award.

10. Presentation of a discipline-related workshop to in-field academic peers.

At the time of review for promotion/tenure, the minimum criteria for outstanding scholarship shall be determined by <u>totaling</u> the number of publications and presentations expected for the candidate's reported effort for each year under review, going back to the initial appointment as Assistant Professor. If at the time of initial appointment the candidate was awarded probationary credit, or if the candidate was initially appointed as an Associate Professor, the expectations shall be modified as appropriate.

Expectations for outstanding achievement in Category 1 and Category 2 vary in proportion to the candidate's reported effort for scholarship, as described in the following table:

Objective	Reported Effort for Scholarship	Scholarship Expectations (Philosophy)
Tenure/promotion to Associate Professor	10% (4/4)	Fulfill one criterion from Category 1 <u>and</u> two criteria from Category 2 above, in any combination.
	30% (3/3)	Fulfill three criteria from Category 1 <u>and</u> four criteria from Category 2 above, in any combination.
	50% (2/2)	Fulfill five criteria from Category 1 <u>and</u> six criteria from Category 2 above, in any combination.
Promotion to Professor	10% (4/4)	Fulfill two criteria from Category 1 <u>and</u> four criteria from Category 2 above, in any combination.
	30% (3/3)	Fulfill six criteria from Category 1 <u>and</u> eight criteria from Category 2 above, in any combination.
	50% (2/2)	Fulfill eleven criteria from Category 1 <u>and</u> thirteen criteria from Category 2 above, in any combination.

Service Expectations

Service refers to activities that contribute directly or indirectly to the well-being of the university, college, department, profession, or broader community. These activities may be solicited or unsolicited, paid or unpaid. In evaluations of service for promotion/tenure, primary consideration is given to professional service in the area of the candidate's expertise and that furthers the mission of Augusta University. Service activities outside Augusta University which relate to fulfilling one's civic duty but not to the candidate's expertise should *not* be considered in evaluating service.

See the college guidelines for college-wide expectations for satisfactory service. Department and discipline-specific expectations for satisfactory service are described below. Note that service expectations are the same for all disciplines in the Department.

Expectations for satisfactory ("meets the standards") achievement in service criteria vary in proportion to the candidate's reported effort for service, as described in the following table:

Objective	Reported Effort for Service	Service Expectations (Department-wide)
Tenure/promotion to Associate Professor	10%	The candidate is expected to have an average of at least 1 significant service commitment per year, with a total of 5 by the time of application.
Promotion to Professor	10%	The candidate is expected to average at least 1 to 2 significant service commitments per year after becoming an associate professor with a total of 7 by the time of application.

REQUIRED APPLICATION MATERIALS

An application for promotion/tenure consists of two principal components:

1. **Letters from external reviewers**

   Three letters from external reviewers are required to support requests for tenure or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor or higher.

   The process of selecting reviewers should begin at least four months prior to the start of the fall term in which the candidate intends to apply.

   See *Letters from External Reviewers* below for more information.

2. **The Promotion and Tenure Portfolio**

   The Promotion and Tenure Portfolio ("portfolio" hereafter) is compiled by the candidate to summarize and to evidence his/her achievements in teaching, scholarship, and service since the time of hire or last promotion.

   The portfolio is due *no later than the start of the Fall term.* Consult the college calendar of promotion/tenure deadlines on the HR Promotion and Tenure Process website for the specific date.

See *Promotion and Tenure Portfolio Requirements* below for more information.

LETTERS FROM EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

Requests for tenure or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor or higher must be supported by three letters from external (non-AU) peers or academic leaders *of the same or higher rank and tenure as that to which the candidate is applying*.

To ensure adequate time to obtain the letters, the process of selecting external reviewers should occur in the spring term, *at least four months prior to the start of the fall term in which the candidate intends to apply*, and requests for letters should be made at least three months prior to the start of the fall term.

Refer to the college guidelines for detailed information about selecting and contacting external reviewers for letters, ensuring the confidentiality of the reviews, and other topics.

PROMOTION AND TENURE PORTFOLIO

The candidate for promotion/tenure must submit a portfolio that documents his/her achievements in teaching, scholarship, and service. Those achievements shall be assessed in the light of the candidate's reported effort, rank, and years of service, and in accordance with the promotion/tenure criteria specified in these and the college guidelines.

The candidate should present the information that best supports his/her candidacy based on the expectations of his/her discipline. The candidate must submit his/her portfolio to the departmental promotion/tenure committee *no later than the start of the Fall term.* (Consult the college calendar of promotion/tenure deadlines on the HR Promotion and Tenure Process website for the specific date).

Refer to the college guidelines for detailed information about the format and organization of the portfolio. The lists of required and optional forms of evidence that appear in the college guidelines have been refined below to include departmental and discipline-specific materials.

Evidence of Teaching

The portfolio should demonstrate the candidate's achievements in teaching, especially as they pertain to the nine categories of teaching effectiveness listed under "Teaching Expectations" above.

Required Evidence

The following materials must be included:

- A list of all courses taught, organized by semester and including enrollments, for the past five years.

- Summary Reports of student course evaluations for all courses taught for the past five years.

- Copies of all summative Peer Evaluations of Teaching for the past five years.

<u>Optional Evidence</u>

Additional evidence may include, but is not limited to:

- Up to three formative Peer Evaluations of Teaching or letters from peers who have watched the candidate teach.

- Letters from up to 5 graduate students/advisees that address the quality of the supervision received (if advising graduate students).

- A list of examples of student achievements such as projects, awards, honors theses, publications, presentations, time to degree for graduate students.

- A list of course and program development activities.

- Evidence that the candidate assesses whether or not s/he has been successful in improving student learning outcomes.

- An annotated list of pedagogical literature and instructional development sessions that have influenced the candidate's teaching and how the candidate has addressed this information in planning his/her classes and instructional strategies.

- Data on student performance on standardized examinations pertinent to the discipline.

- Data on student performance in subsequent courses.

- Evidence of Scholarly Teaching. (See Section 4.7.2 in the USG *Academic & Student Affairs Handbook* for definitions and criteria.)

- Other evidence that reflects excellence in teaching.

Evidence of Scholarship

The portfolio should demonstrate the candidate's achievements in scholarship, research, or creative endeavors, including the dissemination of his/her work through publication and other peer-reviewed outlets. Since not every publication or creative endeavor is of equal intellectual merit, the candidate should define and make the case for what is significant.

<u>Required Evidence</u>

The following materials <u>must</u> be included:

- A list of all publications that explicitly designates peer review from others.

- A list of refereed conference presentations.

- A list of relevant creative endeavors and activities, including art exhibitions; professional poetry recitals; theatrical, dance, or music performances; etc.

- A list of grants, fellowships, and scholarships as appropriate to the discipline, with funding amounts and time periods during which funding was active.

<u>Optional Evidence</u>

Additional evidence may include, but is not limited to:

- Copies of significant publications by the candidate.

- A list of invited seminars and presentations.

- A list of funded research activities, with funding amounts.

- A list of involvement in the scholarly, research, and creative products of students and other trainees, including but not limited to, conference presentations, publications, and like creative activities.

- Evidence consistent with the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, the Scholarship of Engagement, and The Scholarship of Discovery. (See Section 4.7.2 in the USG *Academic & Student Affairs Handbook* for definitions and criteria.)

- Other evidence that highlights peer recognition of the quality and sustainable contributions of the candidate's scholarship in the field.

Evidence of Service

The portfolio should demonstrate the candidate's service as a member of communities within and beyond Augusta University, and in activities that draw upon the candidate's professional expertise.

<u>Required</u>

The following materials <u>must</u> be included:

- A list of international, national, or regional professional committees, including any offices held.

- A list of USG, Augusta University, college, and departmental committees, organized by level, indicating leadership roles.

<u>Optional</u>

Additional evidence may include, but is not limited to:

- Evidence that the faculty member links his or her work in some way to public contemporary issues and/or to improving quality of life.

- Evidence that the faculty member, either through scholarly work and/or service, applies knowledge toward solutions to complex societal problems and human needs.

- Evidence that the faculty member contributes to the continuous improvement of higher education.

- Evidence that the faculty member contributes in some way to the public good.

- Evidence that the faculty member has served his or her profession through professional organizations and/or other professionally oriented entities.

PROCESS OVERVIEW

An overview of the promotion and tenure processes is outlined in Figures 1 and 2, respectively, of the university guidelines

As the candidate's materials move up the review process, each level will decide whether to support candidate's request for promotion/tenure. At each step of the process *that is marked with an asterisk* (*) in Figures 1 and 2 of the university guidelines (the Chair, Dean, and Provost steps), candidates shall be notified via Augusta University email within five (5) business days of the recommendation and receive a copy of the written summary. **Note that any identifying references to external reviewers must be redacted in the copy sent to the candidate.** A copy of this notification should also be sent to the candidate's Department Chair.

If, at any level (including review levels not marked with an asterisk), the recommendation is made not to support the candidate's request, the candidate and the previous level of review shall be notified immediately in writing of that decision. In such cases, the process stops and the candidate's materials should not be forwarded to the next level unless the candidate appeals the decision. See *Appeals of Promotion and Tenure Decisions* below.

Additional information about the process, including the procedures for negative decisions and candidate appeals, may be found in the college guidelines.

PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE GUIDELINES

The following guidelines apply to all members of any promotion/tenure committee:

- No individual shall serve on more than one promotion/tenure committee at different levels (department, college, university).

- No faculty member in a position at or above the level of Department Chair shall serve on any promotion/tenure committee.

- All promotion/tenure committee members shall adhere to AU's Individual Conflict of Interest policy.

- The chair of the promotion/tenure committee at each level (department and college) will provide a 1-3 page letter containing a written summary of the committee's recommendation for promotion and/or tenure. If the candidate has requested *both* promotion *and* tenure, the letter must contain separate sentences conveying the committee's recommendation with regard to each request. The letter should be prepared on official letterhead, should be addressed to the chair/head of the next level of review, and should address the candidate's achievements in teaching, scholarship, and service. This letter will be added to Appendix A of the candidate's promotion/tenure portfolio as it moves to the next level of review. See *Process Overview* above for additional details on the review process.

Additional guidelines for the departmental committee are described below.

Departmental Committee Guidelines

Unless the candidate is an administrator or has a cross-departmental/cross-college appointment (see *Exceptions to Departmental Review* in the college guidelines), the promotion/tenure process begins with a departmental committee recommendation. Each department will establish a standing Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee ("departmental committee" hereafter).

The departmental committee will write a formal, detailed letter with an explicit recommendation concerning promotion/tenure for each candidate. The letter, which should be considered a form of peer review, must articulate clear reasons for the committee's recommendation, summarizing or making specific references to the evidence presented in the candidate's portfolio. Additionally, the letter should specifically address and qualitatively evaluate any material that may be difficult for non-specialists to evaluate. This letter should be prepared on departmental letterhead and inserted in Appendix A of the candidate's portfolio.

The departmental committee shall adhere to the following guidelines:

1. The departmental committee shall be made up of faculty with a 50% or greater appointment in the Department of History, Anthropology and Philosophy. Eligible faculty with less than a 50% appointment in the Department may be added to the Departmental committee for renewable, one-year terms by the Department Chair. Neither the Department Chair, nor any faculty member serving on a promotion/tenure committee at a level above the departmental committee, shall serve on the departmental committee.

2. The departmental committee shall have as members all eligible tenured, full-time faculty at the rank of Associate Professor and higher.

3. The departmental committee must have no less than three members.

4. Recommendations for promotion and tenure shall be made by a minimum of three members of the departmental committee who hold a rank equal or higher than that being sought by the candidate.

5. In the event the Department does not have three eligible faculty members who meet the aforementioned criteria, the Department Chair may appoint qualified faculty members from other departments in the college to serve in a limited capacity on the departmental committee, or may empower all tenured faculty in the Department to vote on a candidate's recommendation for promotion (excluding the Department Chair and any faculty member serving on a promotion/tenure committee at a level above the departmental committee).

6. During the first academic meeting of the departmental committee, the committee will elect one of the Professors of the Department to serve as chair for that academic year. If there are no (full) Professors, the chair will make certain that a full professor will be chosen from outside the department to guide the committee. The chair of the departmental committee will be responsible for scheduling meetings, distributing portfolios to the committee members, recording votes, and formally communicating the departmental committee recommendations.

7. When outside members are appointed to a departmental committee, every effort should be made to solicit members who have some understanding of the disciplines contained within the Department and some familiarity with those disciplines' norms for excellence. Outside members should only participate in discussions and votes on candidates identified by the Department Chair.

8. The departmental committee will meet in person to discuss the candidate's application, and to vote by open-ballot on a formal recommendation.

9. The departmental committee requires a quorum of at least two-thirds of its members for a recommendation about promotion or tenure, as long as it is not less than three.

10. Positive recommendations will require at least a two-thirds majority of those present and voting.

11. While the results of voting must be recorded, no other minutes of the meetings will be kept.

12. Appeals of departmental committee decisions are to be made in accordance with the appeal procedures outlined in the university guidelines.

PRE-TENURE REVIEW

Each faculty member's department shall provide a comprehensive pre-tenure review of his/her progress toward tenure during the candidate's third year of service. If the faculty member was hired with prior credit toward tenure, a mid-course review shall be conducted.

The review committee should instruct the candidate to submit his/her materials by **January 15** of the appropriate year, and must complete its review—including communicating its findings by written report to the candidate and the Department Chair—*no later than March 15 of that year.*

The review shall be conducted by a committee of three tenured faculty with a rank of Associate Professor or above, appointed by the Chair. The Chair will make every effort to appoint senior faculty in the same discipline as the pre-tenure review candidate.

Additional details about the timing, format, and process to be used for pre-tenure review are described in the college guidelines.

POST-TENURE REVIEW

Annually, Human Resources will provide the Dean with a list of faculty who are due for post-tenure review. The review shall be conducted five years after the faculty member's most recent promotion or personnel action, and reviews shall continue at five-year intervals unless interrupted by a further review for promotion. The review committee should instruct the candidate to submit his/her materials by **January 15** of that year, and must complete its review—including communicating its findings by written report to the candidate and the Department Chair—*no later than March 15 of that year.*

The faculty member shall submit a Post-Tenure Review Portfolio that describes his/her achievements in teaching, scholarship, and service since the time of last review. The review will encompass teaching, scholarship, and service. It will focus on the materials presented in the portfolio, which will be assessed in the light of the faculty member's current job description, reported effort, rank, and years of service. Details about post-tenure review, including the portfolio requirements, are described in the college guidelines.

Competence in all three areas is expected, as is excellence in the areas of primary activity. Lack of activity in an area for three years shall be deemed unsatisfactory.

Additional details about the timing, format, and process to be used for post-tenure review are described in the college guidelines.

DOCUMENT HISTORY

1/13/2016 -- Version 1.00 approved by unanimous vote of the faculty of the Department of History, Anthropology and Philosophy, Augusta University.

1/29/2016 -- "Chair-assigned effort" was changed to "reported effort" (which is more accurate) and all references to URLs with "gru.edu" were updated to "augusta.edu" by W. Kisting.

2/16/2016 -- The Scholarship Category list order for Anthropology and Philosophy was reversed so publication/grants are Category 1 (and "Persistent Scholarly Presence" is Category 2); the term "excellent" was replaced with "outstanding" and "meets the standards" to mirror the university guidelines by W. Kisting.

3/23/2016 -- Updates to the document were made by Department faculty and Chair (A. Goss, W. Turner, J. Trunzo).

4/15/2016 – Final copy approved by faculty vote of the Department of History, Anthropology and Philosophy, Augusta University.

4/18/2016 – W. Kisting added numeric date code to page 1 footer to signal final approval by the Dean, refreshed format of headings to match original template layout, created a new Heading 4 alternate style to mark subdivisions of scholarship criteria for each of the three departmental disciplines, inserted a new bullet #1 under "Promotion & Tenure Committee Guidelines" to reflect mandatory notification required in university guidelines, and restored a missing cross-reference to the college guidelines at the end of the "Post-Tenure Review" section.

10/9/2020 – W. Kisting updated multiple sections of this document to reflect changes/updates to the university guidelines that had been incorporated into the college guidelines, but not the departmental guidelines. These included changes/clarifications in the due date for candidate P&T portfolios (now directing the candidate to consult the yearly college calendar for reliable information about deadlines); changes in the required organization of the portfolio (annual evaluations no longer go in the Evidence of Teaching section, but instead have their own formal section in the portfolio); an updated Process Overview section (which now aligns with the AU guidance that notifications/copies of P&T recommendations only go to candidates at those levels marked with an asterisk in the university guidelines: namely, the Chair, Dean, and Provost steps); expanded guidance about the focus and format of P&T committee recommendation letters (per request from past review committees); and expanded guidance about the format and routing of departmental P&T recommendations (in response to questions/requests for clarification from past reviewers).

Appendix A:
Equivalencies for Publications

There is no distinction made in platform (digital, print copy). The important distinction is type and impact of press and the review process. Higher value is placed on publications which have been through a rigorous peer-review process. The best review is the double-blind review, meaning it has been reviewed by an editor who stripped off the name of author and his/her affiliations and sent it on "blind" to a reviewer or review team unknown to the author. In this way, the review is "double blind" since it was blind in both directions for the review. This is the gold standard for publication in history, anthropology and philosophy. Other forms of rigorous peer-review are acceptable as well, as in some cases (i.e. for a full-length monograph on a specialized topic) it is impossible to hide the identity of the author of the manuscript.

Further, at least one-half of the material produced by any candidate up for review at the promotion and tenure levels should be based on research. A candidate may not solely work on edited, translated, abstracts of presentations, etc., no matter how many the candidate produces. Each individual must engage in his or her research. At later stages, such as post-tenure review, candidates may opt to have more editorial or translation work rather than first-author, primary source based research; although, he or she is expected to keep up a minimal level of engagement in the field since this is best practice for excellence in teaching.

For all "Not reviewed/self-published" material, and any other material which has variable weight in the equivalency tables below, the candidate must provide justification for its value and importance. The Department Chair, in consultation with the Chair of the departmental committee, will assign the equivalence value for each one of these materials. Justification for prestige/impact rank (high/middle/low) of the press or the journal must be provided by candidate. The final determination of the rank will be made by the Department Chair in consultation with the Chair of the departmental committee.

Books

Monograph

Peer-reviewed, double-blind, high press	=	7 peer-reviewed articles
Peer-reviewed, middle press	=	6 peer-reviewed articles
Peer-reviewed, low press	=	5 peer-reviewed articles
Not reviewed/self-published	=	0.0-2.0 peer-reviewed article

Single authored monographs which are at a late stage of review by an academic press may be considered towards this category, for between 0.5 and 7 peer-reviewed articles. Appropriate correspondence from the press must be provided.

Co-Authored Monograph

Peer-reviewed, double-blind, high press	=	6 peer-reviewed articles
Peer-reviewed, middle press	=	5 peer-reviewed articles
Peer-reviewed, low press	=	4 peer-reviewed articles
Not reviewed/self-published	=	0.0-1.0 peer-reviewed article

Justification for candidate's contribution to co-authored works must be provided by candidate. The final determination will be made by the Department Chair in consultation with the Chair of the Departmental Committee.

Edited volume of multi-author collection (first editor or co-editor)

Peer-reviewed, double-blind, high to mid press	=	4 peer-reviewed articles
Peer-reviewed, low press	=	3 peer-reviewed articles
Not reviewed/self-published	=	0.0-0.2 peer-reviewed article

Secondary- or lesser-editor of multi-editor, edited volume of multi-author collection

Peer-reviewed	=	2 peer-reviewed articles
Not reviewed	=	0.0-0.25 peer-reviewed article

Editor and/or translator of annotated source

Book length, peer-reviewed	=	4 peer-reviewed articles
Book length, not reviewed/self-published	=	0.0-1.0 peer-reviewed article
Article length, peer-reviewed	=	1 peer-reviewed article

Textbook

Double-blind, high press	=	3.0-5.0 peer-reviewed articles
Middle press	=	2.0-4.0 peer-reviewed articles
Low press	=	1.0-3.0 peer-reviewed articles
Not reviewed/self-published	=	0.0-0.2 peer-reviewed article

Articles

Single-authored Article or Chapter (considered the same)

Peer-reviewed journal article (the standard)	=	1 peer-reviewed articles
Peer-reviewed chapters in peer-reviewed edited books	=	1 peer-reviewed articles
Non-reviewed journal article, including those for public	=	0.0-0.5 peer-reviewed article

| Peer-reviewed article in prestigious or high-impact journal (justification for prestige must be provided by candidate) | = | 1.0-2.0 peer-reviewed articles |

Co-Authored Article or Chapter

| Peer-reviewed journal article (the standard) | = | 0.4-0.8 peer-reviewed article |
| Peer-reviewed chapter in peer-reviewed edited book | = | 0.4-0.8 peer-reviewed article |

Justification for candidate's contribution to co-authored works must be provided by candidate. The final determination will be made by the Department Chair in consultation with the Chair of the Departmental Committee.

Introduction, Conclusion, Foreword, or Afterword

| Peer-reviewed | = | 0.2 – 0.5 peer-reviewed article |
| Not reviewed | = | 0 (not credited) |

Papers published in proceedings

In book	=	See chapters in *Articles* section above.
In journal	=	See articles in *Articles* section above.
Published peer-reviewed abstract	=	0.3 peer-reviewed article
Published, non-reviewed abstract (such as in organization newsletter)	=	0 (not credited)

Other Published Scholarship

Editing a journal, book series

This scholarly activity usually reflects persistent scholarly presence and/or service to the profession, however in certain cases, candidates may be able to show that journal or book editorial activity reflects scholarship that has an equivalency to publishing a peer-reviewed article.

Grants or Other Funding

Grants, Fellowships, & Scholarships

| Securing an external Grant, Fellowship, or Scholarship over $25,000 | = | 2.0-4.0 peer-reviewed articles |
| Securing an external Grant, Fellowship, or Scholarship under $25,000 | = | 0.0-2.0 peer-reviewed articles |

Other Publications, including Public history with scholarly activity component

Museum exhibit or commemorative event	=	0.25-2.0 peer-reviewed articles, depending on extent of involvement
Published historical white-paper or report (no review)	=	0.5 peer-reviewed article
Book review	=	0.25 peer-reviewed article
Article in encyclopedia or dictionary	=	0.2 – 0.5 peer-reviewed article

Appendix B:
Equivalencies for Presentations

Presentations are counted separately from publications. Each candidate is expected to engage with the wider academic community on a yearly basis, presenting research when possible and as funding is available. This is important for best practices in teaching as well as building knowledge in the discipline and finding or keeping up a research agenda.

For those candidates prior to tenure or promotion to Associate Professor, they may make up the necessary number of talks using any combination of the following.

A candidate for (full) Professor is expected to regularly give national presentations and at least half of his or her presentations since the last review or time of hire should be at that level or beyond.

Invited talks/Keynote talks at conferences or universities

Keynote address at national or international conference	=	3 peer-reviewed presentations
Invited talks at a university or conference, regional or higher (invited by peers)	=	2 peer-reviewed presentations

Presentations (peer-reviewed acceptance)

National / International (the standard)	=	1 peer-reviewed presentation
Local / Regional	=	0.75 peer-reviewed presentation

Public History and Digital scholarship

Online talk	=	Same as above depending on level
Docent work or public talk	=	0.5 peer-reviewed presentation

Workshops

Workshop presentation for discipline (peer-reviewed)	=	Same as presentations above, by level
Workshop presentation for discipline (non-reviewed), SoTL presentation, or other workshop-type presentation or public history talk	=	0.5 peer-reviewed presentation
Organizer of a workshop, panel, session, or conference; Commentator; or Chair of a conference panel	=	0 (belongs in service)