



AUBURN UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS

GUIDELINES

History Department

Workload
Faculty Annual Review
Third-Year Review
Promotion and Tenure

9/30/11

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT, ANNUAL REVIEW, AND PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

CLA Guidelines Approved 8/24/09, Updated 12/9/09

History Department guidelines approved by the department 11/17/2009. Approved by CLA 1/15/2010.

Amended by History Department 3/30/2010; 10/25/2010.

Amended by Provost 1/31/2011 to remove policy on Merit Raises.

Amended by Provost 4/1/2011 with minor revisions.

Approved by Provost 5/2011

Amended by Provost 9/30/2011 to reflect changes in Faculty Handbook

The Department of History Faculty Development and Evaluation Manual supplements and complements the Auburn University Faculty Handbook and College of Liberal Arts guidelines. Since the basic and fundamental review of faculty takes place within the department, the purpose of these guidelines is to describe and elaborate upon the criteria and guidelines for faculty assignments, faculty evaluation, and promotion and tenure at the departmental level. Department guidelines are intended to conform to those of the Auburn University Faculty Handbook (revised 6/17/11) and the College of Liberal Arts. Therefore, it is important for faculty to study carefully the criteria, requirements, and procedures outlined in these guidelines and in the University and College documents. In event of conflict among documents, their precedence is University, College, Department. Any reference to the Faculty Handbook in this document refers to the current version.

The history department's faculty evaluation process is intended to guide faculty toward enhanced success; clarify faculty goals; inform annual assignments that reflect the short and long-term vision of the department; include faculty in discussions and decisions; and provide consistent and clear criteria for promotion and tenure recommendations, as applicable.

The faculty evaluation process in the College of Liberal Arts includes several components, among them the letter of appointment, annual workload assignment, and annual performance reviews and feedback. Tenure track and Clinical track positions include provision for promotion review. Tenure track faculty are subject to a third-year review to determine the extent to which the individual is making clear progress toward tenure. Failure to demonstrate clear progress in teaching, research, outreach, and service (as applicable to the faculty member's assignment) may lead to the issuance of a letter of non-continuance at any time before tenure. The focus of the third-year review for clinical track faculty is the faculty member's progress toward achieving promotion to associate clinical professor, yet still recognizing that clinical faculty are on continuing appointments that necessitate annual contract renewal. Failure to demonstrate clear progress in assigned areas of performance (such as clinical teaching, clinical outreach, service, scholarship, professional development) may lead to the issuance of a letter of non-continuance, effective at the conclusion of the annual contract in force.

Reference to "Tenure track" faculty in this document includes tenured faculty, unless otherwise noted.

The Appointment Letter

The appointment letter defines broad expectations of the position, including percentages of the assignment allocated to teaching, research, outreach, and service. Examples of appointment letters may be found at the following URL:

https://sites.auburn.edu/academic/COLA/CLA_Dean/cladeptguidelines/SitePages/Home.aspx

Annual Workload Assignment

Annual faculty assignments reflect that faculty members working in various disciplines contribute in different ways. Annual assignment plans reflect collaborative discussion between faculty and department chair. They provide opportunity to review progress, set goals, guide faculty toward success, and clarify metrics of evaluation. All Tenure track faculty, Clinical track faculty, Non-Tenure track faculty, Instructors, and Lecturers should participate in formalized annual assignment planning and feedback.

The College of Liberal Arts Workload Guidelines state:

Initial workload assignments for tenure-track faculty (TTF) are negotiated upon hire, and are distributed across all areas of responsibility; teaching, research/creative scholarly works, outreach, extension and service. Occasionally, administrative duties may also be included as a percent of a faculty member's workload if it is part of their normal assignment. Workload assignments may be adjusted on an annual basis during the annual review process to reflect any changes in a faculty member's assignment for the following year. The department head/chair meets with each faculty member during the faculty annual review process to discuss and negotiate anticipated workload changes. The faculty member signs the annual review which includes the stated workload assignment for the following year to assure that every faculty member is aware of his/her responsibilities. The original signed annual review is to be kept in the departmental personnel file. Three copies are to be submitted to the Office of the Dean (one copy will be kept on file in the Dean's Office, one copy will be placed in the CLA's faculty personnel file and one copy will be delivered to the Office of the Provost).

Description of Types of Faculty Positions

Tenure Track Faculty (TTF)

The "typical" annual teaching assignment for "research active" TTF is 5 courses¹ (or department FTE equivalent) equaling 62.5% per year. Consistent with university guidelines, all research active TTF are assigned a minimum 25% research/creative/scholarly outreach² workload for promotion and tenure purposes. The annual teaching assignment for "highly productive" research TTF is 4 courses³ (or department FTE equivalent) equaling 50% per year. The status of highly productive research TTF requires the approval of the Dean. In situations where a tenured associate professor or professor is not fulfilling a 25% requirement for scholarly activity, the department chair will provide a memorandum of understanding (MOU) to ensure that a tenured faculty member has a 100% workload. In this case, the faculty member would be assigned a differential workload with a minimum of 10% research, in order to stay current in the field for teaching purposes. It is expected that the faculty member will receive an increase in the teaching load, with the understanding that he/she cannot be promoted just on teaching. Research productivity will be considered over a 3 year period. If a faculty member is not research productive for 3 years, then there will be an increase in the teaching load proportionally. During that 3-year period, if he/she does become productive and demonstrates that he/she can be productive for 3 years in research, then there will be a reduction in the teaching load to acknowledge the increase in research.

Instructors/Lecturers

Instructors and Lecturers will be assigned 100% teaching loads of 8 courses per year. Any exceptions will need approval by the Dean. In addition to the definition of teaching stated in the faculty handbook, teaching in CLA includes: holding regular office hours, mentoring and advising students, keeping current in the field, attendance of departmental meetings relevant to teaching, participating in departmental life and the engagement of students.

Non-Tenure-Track Faculty (NTTF – as designated by HR)

NTTF may be assigned some teaching; but it cannot exceed one course per semester and three courses per year.

Appendix 1 outlines the university's expectations for teaching, research, outreach, and service.

Workload adjustment for sabbaticals and leaves. Faculty on sabbatical or professional development leave related to teaching would normally be evaluated as a temporary 100% teaching appointment for leave extending across the evaluation period. Faculty on sabbatical or professional development leave related

¹ A course is defined as a 3 contact hour course.

² "In terms of your questions, it is my understanding that the former Provost said that a tenure track faculty member on hire must have a minimum of 25% research, scholarship of pedagogy or outreach, or creative activity. Therefore, I will continue that tradition."
- Email from Dr. Mazey sent to Paula Bobrowski 5/10/2009.

³ Ibid.

to research would normally be evaluated as a temporary 100% research appointment for leave extending across the evaluation period. A similar allocation may apply for other types of leave. In any case, the evaluation metrics must add up to 100% and factor in the faculty member's regular appointment during the portion of the review period not on leave.

[See Appendix 2 for Departmental Workload Guidelines.](#)

Annual Performance Reviews and Feedback

The annual review serves as a tool for faculty development at all ranks, regardless of tenure status.

All faculty receive annual evaluations. All Tenure track faculty, Clinical track faculty, Non-Tenure track faculty, Instructors, and Lecturers should participate in formalized annual assignment planning and feedback.

Performance Descriptors. The annual review of performance in each area to which one is assigned will be assessed a performance score of 4 - Exemplary (characterizing performance of high merit), 3 - Exceeds Expectations (characterizing performance of merit), 2 - Meets Expectations (characterizing performance sufficient to justify continuation but, for areas of expected significant contribution, not sufficient to justify promotion or tenure), 1 – Marginal (characterizing performance that may not be sufficient to justify continuation) or 0 – Unacceptable (characterizing performance not sufficient to justify continuation).

See Appendix 3 for Workload Distribution and Performance Review Chart.

The annual review normally covers performance for the preceding calendar year. Research productivity will be considered over a 3-year period. Evaluative statements from previous years will be consulted to determine response to previous suggestions for improvement and to determine the extent to which the individual is making progress toward promotion and tenure, if applicable, to their appointment.

[See Appendix 4 for Departmental Annual Review Guidelines.](#)

Written evaluation report

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

The unit head shall prepare a written report summarizing the major points of the conference. A copy of the report shall be provided to the faculty member within a month of the conference. If there are no objections, the faculty member shall be asked to sign it as confirmation of having seen it. If the faculty member does not agree with the material in the report, he or she may write a response to be appended to the report. A copy of the signed report and response, if there is one, is to be retained for the faculty member's departmental personnel file; another copy is to be given to the faculty member; a third copy is sent to the Office of the Provost. To the extent permitted by law, the report is to remain confidential, available only for the use of the concerned faculty member and any University officials who have supervisory power over the faculty member.

Third-Year Review

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

Each department shall conduct a third year review of all its probationary faculty members. This shall take place no later than 32 months after initial appointment, normally before April 30 of the faculty member's third year. The head shall request a current vita and any supporting material the head or the faculty member deems appropriate prior to the review. The particular focus of this review is the faculty member's progress toward achieving tenure. The review therefore must address the criteria for tenure set forth in this document. To be maximally useful to the candidate and the department, the review shall involve the

entire tenured faculty. In order for it to accurately reveal the judgment of tenured faculty, it shall conclude with a vote on whether or not, in the judgment of the tenured faculty, the candidate is making appropriate progress toward tenure. The result of the vote shall be announced at the meeting. Faculty should understand that this vote is not a commitment to grant or deny tenure in the future.

The head shall prepare a written report covering the findings of the review, and characterizing the nature of the vote. The procedure described above for the report on the yearly conference shall be followed, with the difference that this report may be consulted by the tenured faculty when the faculty member is a candidate for tenure; otherwise, the report is to remain confidential [to the extent allowable by law].

See Appendix 5 for Departmental Third-Year Review Guidelines.

Promotion and Tenure Review

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

Promotion is based on merit. A candidate for promotion should have acceptable achievements in the areas of 1) teaching and/or outreach and 2) research/creative work. He or she is further expected to demonstrate over a sustained period distinctive achievement in one of these areas or achievement in both areas comparable to that of successful candidates in the discipline in the past five years. In addition, he or she is expected to have contributed some service to the University. Candidates covered by Provost approved departmental promotion and tenure guidelines will be evaluated accordingly. For candidates not covered by Provost approved departmental promotion and tenure guidelines, the criteria for teaching, research/creative work, and outreach described below [see Appendix 1] shall be considered by the faculty in the evaluation of a candidate's performance and achievement. The candidate's employment conditions and academic assignments shall determine which criteria are most emphasized, and standards for promotion are based on the weights of each performance area as described in the letter of offer and subsequent annual evaluations. Credit shall also be given for contributions above and beyond specifically assigned duties

Appendix 1 outlines the university's expectations for teaching, research, outreach, and service.

Regarding tenure, the AU Faculty Handbook states:

Auburn University nurtures and defends the concept of academic tenure which assures each faculty member freedom, without jeopardy at the department, college or school, or University level, to criticize and advocate changes in existing theories, beliefs, programs, policies, and institutions and guarantees faculty members the right to support, without jeopardy, any colleague whose academic freedom is threatened. Tenure establishes an environment in which truth can be sought and expressed in one's teaching, research/creative work, outreach work, and service. In addition to demonstrating quality in the areas of 1) teaching, 2) research/creative work, 3) outreach and 4) service as described above under Promotion Criteria and, where applicable, in approved departmental guidelines, the candidate for tenure must also demonstrate potential to contribute as a productive and collegial member of the academic unit in all relevant areas.

Candidates for promotion and tenure should carefully read the Promotion and Tenure policies found in the AU Faculty Handbook. A timeline for the candidate's submission of materials for evaluation for promotion and tenure will be established each year by the Office of the Provost.

See Appendix 6 for Departmental Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.

Post-Tenure Review

Tenured faculty at Auburn are subject to post-tenure review as outlined on the Provost's website at the following URL: http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/policies/2009-11_post-tenured-review-policy.pdf

Appendix 1

Auburn University's Expectations for Teaching, Research, Outreach, and Service

Teaching

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

Since a primary activity of the University is the instruction of students, careful evaluation of teaching is essential. Because of the difficulty of evaluating teaching effectiveness, faculty members are urged to consider as many relevant measures as possible in appraising the candidate. These include consideration of the candidate's knowledge of the subject and his or her professional growth in the field of specialization; the candidate's own statement of his or her teaching philosophy; the quality of the candidate's teaching as indicated by peer and student evaluations and teaching awards; performance of the candidate's students on standardized tests or in subsequent classes; the candidate's contributions to the academic advising of students; the candidate's development of new courses and curricula; the quality of the candidate's direction of dissertations, theses, independent study projects, etc.; and the quality of pedagogical material published by the candidate.

Research/Creative Work

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

A faculty member engaged in research/creative work has an obligation to contribute to his or her discipline through applied and/or basic research, through creative endeavors, or through interpretive scholarship. To a large extent, each discipline and each department must determine how much and what quality of research/creative work is appropriate for promotion (and/or tenure) and judge its candidates accordingly. In appraising the candidate's work, faculty members should consider the quality and significance of the work, the quality of the outlet for publication or exhibition, and, in cases of collaborative work, the role of the candidate.

Research and creative work ordinarily can be documented by a candidate's publications or performances/exhibitions. Publication subjected to critical review by other scholars as a condition of publication should carry more weight than publication that is not refereed. Nevertheless, all forms of publication, including articles intended for a non-academic audience, should be considered provided they are of high quality in relation to the purpose intended. Scholarly papers subjected to peer review and delivered at a regional or national conference and creative work subjected to peer review and performed or exhibited on a regional or national level should carry more weight than work done only on a local level.

Successful efforts in obtaining extramural support for research/creative work (as well as for teaching and outreach programs) should also be positively considered in evaluation of the candidate.

Outreach

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

Outreach refers to the function of applying academic expertise to the direct benefit of external audiences in support of university and unit missions. A faculty endeavor may be regarded as outreach scholarship for purposes of tenure and promotion if all the following conditions are met: 1) there is a substantive link with significant human needs and societal problems, issues or concerns; 2) there is a direct application of knowledge to significant human needs and societal problems, issues, or concerns; 3) there is utilization of the faculty member's academic and professional expertise; 4) the ultimate purpose is for the public or common good; 5) new knowledge is generated for the discipline and/or the audience or clientele; and 6) there is a clear link/relationship between the

program/activities and an appropriate academic unit's mission. Outreach is not expected of all faculty. Participation in this function varies from major, continuing commitments, as is the case with the Alabama Cooperative Extension System, through intermittent engagement for individual faculty as needs and opportunities for a particular expertise arise, to no involvement at all.

The commitment of faculty time to outreach is a decision to be made by the faculty member with the approval of the department in which the faculty member will seek tenure and/or promotion. It may be accomplished in the initial appointment, as is typically the case for Extension faculty, in annual work plans, or during the year in response to unexpected needs. In any case, this decision should be made with due consideration to the professional development of the faculty member, the expected public benefits of the outreach activities, and mission of the department and/or other supporting units. Departmental approval carries a commitment to assess and appropriately weigh outreach contributions in salary, tenure, and promotion recommendations.

Demands for quality in outreach are the same as in teaching and research/creative work; however, outreach activities are different in nature from other activities and must be evaluated accordingly. See Appendix 1 of Faculty Participation in Outreach Scholarship: An Assessment Model, which is available along with other publications on the assessment of outreach under "Outreach Publications" on the University web site. Department heads should request any material necessary from the candidate to facilitate faculty assessment of the type, quality, and effectiveness of the candidate's involvement in extension activities and evaluation of any resulting publications.

Service

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

University service includes participating in departmental, college or school, and University governance and committee work, assisting in the recruitment of new faculty, and developing and assisting in the implementation of new academic programs. Faculty should note particularly distinctive contributions to University life on the part of the candidate, including service to the candidate's profession, such as offices held and committee assignments performed for professional associations and learned societies; and editorships and the refereeing of manuscripts.

Appendix 2

History Department Workload Guidelines for Tenure-Track Faculty

Equity in faculty workloads and providing appropriate support of faculty in reaching career goals are the foundations of this workload policy. In order to promote quality teaching and to maintain an outstanding record of productivity in research and / or outreach, the typical course load for fulltime tenure-track faculty (TTF) in the Department of History is distributed across a three year rotation, as 3:2, 3:2, 3:0. This means that a TTF typically teaches 5 courses per year and receives a one semester release from teaching in each third year (the percentage weight of each assigned course will be 12.5%). The one semester leave facilitates faculty achievement of research and pedagogical goals. The one semester release is essential to fulfilling the mission of the department, college, and university.

In assigning course load, the Chair will consider individual contributions to the department's instructional, research, service and outreach missions. Teaching assignments will promote equity in faculty workloads, and may take into consideration factors such as type of assigned course, and levels of research productivity, administrative assignments, outreach commitments, etc. When possible, teaching assignments should support a faculty member in his or her best effort to fulfill the instructional, research, outreach, and service assignments. However, all teaching assignments must also support the department's capacity to meet course requirements in the core and majors, at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

In the case of a faculty member who has regularly participated in the one semester release rotation, but who has received a rating for their research productivity of marginal or unacceptable for three consecutive years, the Chair may assign additional courses beyond the typical 5 per academic year and adjust his or her workload accordingly. A faculty member designated by the Chair as deficient in research productivity may continue to participate in the one semester release rotation for one more rotation. The next regularly scheduled release semester may be moved to the semester following the designation as research deficient. This potential change in schedule maximizes the opportunity for a designated faculty member to address his or her research deficiency. This release may only be used to address the research deficiency. The general parameters for how the deficiency will be addressed during the semester release, and how the results will be documented and evaluated will be negotiated between the Chair and the faculty member. If the faculty member addresses the deficiency within the following year to the satisfaction of the Chair, he or she will continue to teach the typical 3:2, 3:2, 3:0 course load. If the research deficiency is not satisfactorily addressed within the following year, as determined by the Chair, the Chair may assign to him or to her an increased course load. This additional course assignment may not be fulfilled through summer teaching. If a faculty member does not wish to address the deficiency, he or she may simply elect to accept the increased teaching load.

Faculty members with increased instructional commitments are not exempted from also fulfilling research, outreach and service missions. However, the percentage weighting of mission areas on annual evaluations will reflect any adjustments in course assignments. The percentage weighting of these assignments should as much as possible facilitate faculty success in fulfilling the instructional, research, outreach, and service missions.

APPEALS PROCESS

A designation of deficient in research productivity that will result in an increased teaching load may be appealed by the faculty member to a departmental committee of three tenured faculty members. The composition of that group will consist of one person chosen by the chair, one person chosen by the faculty member, and a third person elected by the department's tenured faculty, in a faculty meeting vote. This appeals committee may only consider whether department procedures on faculty annual review have been followed and fairly applied to assess the work of the faculty member in question. The subcommittee decision will stand as final within the department, but will be subject to the approval of the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts.

Appendix 3

Workload Distribution and Performance Review Chart

DEPARTMENT (insert name here)											
Faculty	Instruction		Research		Outreach		Service		Administrative		TOTAL SCORE
Name	Workload %	Performance Score	Workload %	Performance Score	Workload %	Performance Score	Workload %	Performance Score	Workload %	Performance Score	
<i>Example</i>											
Dr. X	0.63	4	0.25	3	0.07	3	0.05	3	0	0	3.63

Performance Score/Criteria	
0	Unacceptable
1	Marginal
2	Meets expectations
3	Exceeds expectations
4	Exemplary

Appendix 4

Departmental Annual Review Guidelines

The department chair will administer this process, which will involve all tenured, tenure-track, non-tenure track, and instructor/lecturer appointments annually. The department views this process as both evaluative and formative, the idea being to assure a fair process whose goal is to maximize the potential and abilities of each faculty member regardless of his or her level of appointment.

The annual review normally covers performance for the preceding calendar year. Research productivity, however, will be considered over a three-year period. Evaluative statements from previous years will be consulted to determine response to previous suggestions for improvement and to determine the extent to which the individual is making progress toward promotion and tenure, if applicable, to their appointment. Teaching will be evaluated using multiple instruments, including student, peer, and chair evaluations.

Faculty will submit annual reports to the chair after the conclusion of each calendar year by the deadline established by the chair. Before meeting with the individual faculty member, the chair will provide the faculty member with draft notes or points of discussion, encouraging the faculty member to provide further information and clarification as he or she feels necessary.

At the conference, the faculty member and Chair agree on a percentage distribution of work for the following year and make adjustments to the percentage distribution of work for the current year. Workload assignments will be governed by the Department of History Workload Guidelines (Appendix 2).

The evaluation process should follow the guidelines found in the *Faculty Handbook* (§3.7). An unfavorable annual review for tenure-track faculty may result in the issuance of a letter of non-continuation at any time prior to tenure.

Performance Evaluation Criteria

In recognition of the complexity of evaluating the many types of work performed by history faculty in all categories, this policy aims to provide guidance to faculty for goals and to the chair for evaluation. This descriptors and evidence on the following pages are suggestive, but final determination of faculty performance is made by the department chair and is dependent on his or her judgment.

Instruction (annual basis; evidence drawn from multiple instruments, peer, chair, and student evaluations)

- | | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| 0. <i>Unacceptable.</i> | Unwillingness to address persistent problems with teaching and/or evaluations |
| 1. <i>Marginal.</i> | Teaching with less than satisfactory evaluations |
| 2. <i>Meets Expectations.</i> | Teaching with satisfactory evaluations |
| 3. <i>Exceeds Expectations.</i> | Teaching with excellent evaluations <i>or</i> teaching with satisfactory evaluations and success with other teaching related activities such as service learning, supervising students, directed readings, teaching publications, teaching outreach, outside reader, or innovative approaches to teaching |
| 4. <i>Exemplary.</i> | Teaching with excellent evaluations <i>and</i> success with other teaching-related activities such as teaching outreach, extensive student supervision, directed readings, work as outside reader, service learning, or innovative approaches to teaching |

Research (Evidence considered over 3-year period)

- | | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| 0. <i>Unacceptable.</i> | No evidence of progress in research and writing |
| 1. <i>Marginal.</i> | Some progress in research and writing but nothing submitted for publication or for presentation at conferences and professional meetings |
| 2. <i>Meets Expectations.</i> | Significant progress in research and writing; one or more papers under review and papers presented at conferences and professional meetings |
| 3. <i>Exceeds Expectations.</i> | Two or more refereed publications or one edited or co-edited volume; one or more competitive grants or awards |
| 4. <i>Exemplary.</i> | One authored or co-authored book, or three or more refereed publications. One or more significant competitive grants or awards |

Service (annual basis. It is expected that all faculty members will participate in departmental governance and service in one or more department committees. Evidence for the categories below is drawn from both level of membership or leadership and includes not only department service but progressively more extensive service to the university and profession)

- | | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| 0. <i>Unacceptable.</i> | No participation |
| 1. <i>Marginal.</i> | Minimal participation |
| 2. <i>Meets Expectations.</i> | Active participation and/or developing leadership |
| 3. <i>Exceeds Expectations.</i> | Broad participation and leadership and more extensive service |
| 4. <i>Exemplary.</i> | Exceptional leadership and service at all levels |

Outreach (annual basis but will recognize ongoing nature of projects; only applies to faculty with Outreach as part of annual workload assignment)

- | | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| 0. <i>Unacceptable.</i> | No activity |
| 1. <i>Marginal.</i> | Some work on project or with agency but little/no documented progress or impact |
| 2. <i>Meets Expectations.</i> | Documented work on or impact of existing project; evidence of efforts to expand reach of project or create new one(s). |
| 3. <i>Exceeds Expectations.</i> | Documented significant work on or impact of or funding for project(s) |
| 4. <i>Exemplary.</i> | Multiple or complex projects bringing significant funding, positive attention to department/college, or reflecting significant impact on agency or audiences |

Overall Rating (annual basis; calculated by multiplying score for each category by assigned workload percentage)

- | | |
|------------------------------|---|
| <i>Unacceptable.</i> | Overall score of 0–0.49; or rating of Unsatisfactory in any two of the above categories |
| <i>Marginal.</i> | Overall score of 0.50–1.49 |
| <i>Meets Expectations.</i> | Overall score of 1.50–2.49 |
| <i>Exceeds Expectations.</i> | Overall score of 2.50–3.49 |
| <i>Exemplary.</i> | Overall score of 3.49–4.00 |

Sample of Faculty Annual Report Submission Form

<faculty name>	year
----------------	------

Faculty Annual Report

WORKLOAD ASSIGNMENT

Category	current year	next year
Research		
Instruction		
Service		
Outreach		
Administration		

Notes:

- This report covers the CALENDAR YEAR.
- Include only activities/publications actually accomplished/published in this period.
- Provide full bibliographic information for all publications
- Print, sign, and submit completed form to the chair no later than 15 February.

RESEARCH:

1. Books Published
 - a. In current year
 - b. In immediately preceding year
 - c. In year before that
2. Peer Reviewed Articles and other works
 - a. In current year
 - b. In immediately preceding year
 - c. In year before that
3. Book Reviews
 - a. In current year
 - b. In immediately preceding year
 - c. In year before that
4. Non-peer reviewed published works
 - a. In current year
 - b. In immediately preceding year
 - c. In year before that
5. Conferences: Papers Presented, Sessions Chaired, Commentary Given
 - a. In current year
 - b. In immediately preceding year
 - c. In year before that
6. Works in Progress
 - a.
 - b.

INSTRUCTION

- 7. Courses Taught this period (note if peer or student evaluations available for any)
 - a.
 - b.
- 8. Special Courses, Programs, or Instruction-related activity
 - a.
 - b.
- 9. Participation in Graduate Program (Students Completed this term; Major/Minor Students continuing)
 - a.
 - b.

SERVICE

- 10. University, College, and Department Committees
 - a.
 - b.
- 11. Manuscript Consulting
 - a.
 - b.
- 12. Professional Offices Held
 - a.
 - b.

OUTREACH

- 13. Outreach or Extension work
 - a.
 - b.

ADMINISTRATION (leave blank if no administrative workload)

- 14. Administrative Positions Held (at Auburn) and significant accomplishments
 - a.
 - b.

OTHER

- 15. Grants (applied for, received, continuing)
 - a.
 - b.
- 16. Honors Received
 - a.
 - b.
- 17. Other Professional Activity
 - a.
 - b.

signature

date report completed

Appendix 5

History Department Standards for Third Year Review

The Third-Year Review Guidelines of the Department of History follow the guidelines and procedures set forth in the *Faculty Handbook* (§3.7). It is highly recommended that the third-year review dossier follow the Promotion and Tenure format contained in the *Faculty Handbook*.

Criteria for third year review reflect general standards for tenure and promotion as specified in Appendix 6. Candidates should document active efforts and progress within the areas of teaching, research, service, and outreach (when applicable), with the understanding that achievements in these areas at the time of the third year review will often be in process rather than completed. The record of accomplishments in research, teaching, service, and outreach (when applicable) should clearly reveal the candidate's skills and dedication in those areas. The candidate should work cooperatively with other faculty in his or her assigned areas of teaching, research, service, and (if assigned) outreach to advance the mission of the department, college, and university. Overall, the candidate's record should offer the promise of a successful future application for tenure and promotion. If insufficient progress has occurred in any area, the candidate should be notified of the shortcomings and receive advice for improvements. Should performance be greatly deficient in one category, or inadequate in multiple categories, the department chair may recommend to the Dean that a letter of non-continuance be issued; however, a letter of non-continuance may be issued at any time prior to tenure.

More detailed information on the standards and process are available in Appendix 6: Department Tenure and Promotion Guidelines.

Appendix 6

History Department Tenure and Promotion Guidelines

The general university considerations for Promotion and Tenure, including details on eligibility, criteria, and procedures are outlined in the *Faculty Handbook* (§3.8–§3.11). The department of history follows these guidelines, and the following paragraphs explain the standards for promotion and tenure in the History Department.

General Tenure and Promotion Procedures

Faculty members at the ranks of associate and full professor will examine applications for tenure and promotion to associate professor; those at the rank of full professor will examine applications for full professor.

History Department Standards for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

A candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor should demonstrate achievements in the following areas of academic endeavor: skills in teaching as established by various measures of evaluation; a record of research and publication, including a monograph or equivalent, so as to have displayed mastery in the appropriate field and to have achieved some regional or national recognition; active engagement in outreach and service, as appropriate; and a collegial approach to departmental needs and goals. Publications and projects completed before initial hire at Auburn will count as part of the candidate's application if they meet the high standards of scholarly significance required for all published work; in such cases candidates must demonstrate a sustained program of research and publication since arriving at Auburn. The candidate's record should promise a successful career in academia in general and in the department in particular.

History Department Standards for Promotion to Professor

A candidate at this level should fully meet and in some areas exceed the general standards for promotion. The successful candidate should demonstrate: a continued active dedication to superior teaching; the pursuit of an ongoing research and publication program, including the publication of an additional book monograph or the equivalent after promotion to associate professor, so as to have achieved a national or international reputation; an active involvement in outreach and service, as appropriate; and a collegial approach to departmental needs and goals. Evidence of special activism and leadership in one or more of the stated areas of academic achievement is vital for advancement to the rank of professor, although the candidate must not neglect any of the required areas of activity.

History Department Standards for Tenure and Promotion at All Levels

1. Research

The candidate for tenure and/or promotion should work in a cooperative manner with other faculty to advance the research missions of the department, college, and university.

A rigorously refereed book in an appropriate field published by a university or academically-oriented commercial press is an important benchmark on the road to promotion and tenure. Publishing houses known as "vanity presses" are not acceptable for scholarly publication. At the time of application, a candidate should have a book in print or be able to demonstrate that the book manuscript is in the publication schedule of a reputable press. A letter of intent or contract does not entirely fulfill the

requirement. If the book has not yet appeared at the time of the candidate's application, the department will request permission of the candidate to ask the press for copies of the readers' reports for the manuscript.

Refereed journal articles are also an important measure of scholarly accomplishment. When overwhelming evidence of the research's cumulative significance is demonstrable, a considerable body of articles in journals of stature in an appropriate field may substitute for book publication. The number of articles deemed adequate for promotion is five, although more or less than five may be required, depending upon the quality of their scholarly contribution.

In addition to books and articles, a candidate may offer other externally reviewed scholarly works for consideration, including edited volumes of primary sources, studies in book-length article collections and conference proceedings, and scholarly endeavors in non-traditional formats, such as exhibits, oral histories, audio and visual productions, and so forth. Each work of this type may be evaluated at the weight of one or more articles, depending on the level of scholarly contribution involved, with the understanding that at least three of the candidate's scholarly works must consist of articles published in journals of stature in an appropriate field.

When a candidate presents for consideration a body of scholarly work other than a single-authored book monograph, the burden of proof rests with the candidate to demonstrate its scholarly significance. Fulfillment of quantitative norms alone does not guarantee the success of an application since the quality of the work is the primary consideration.

For promotion to full professor, a candidate must have published at least one externally reviewed scholarly book monograph with a reputable university or commercial press at some point in their academic career.

Scholarly activities that reflect standing and activism in a candidate's field such as editing published article collections, historical series, or historical journals will also receive recognition, although such work will not have the weight of published articles or books.

A candidate whose work involves knowledge of foreign languages, travel to foreign countries, or other strenuous circumstances should include information about this in the application. When appropriate, this information may play a role in how a body of research is evaluated but will not alter the necessity to produce a significant body of peer-reviewed research for tenure and promotion at any level.

External awards, grants, fellowships and other similar recognition of research potential and accomplishments enhance an application but do not supplant existing qualitative and quantitative criteria for bringing research to scholarly or, in some cases, general audiences.

History faculty members are expected to participate in the activities of the profession. Writing book reviews, fulfilling various functions at historical conferences, evaluating journal articles and book manuscripts for academic presses, writing encyclopedia entries and articles, and other activities associated with the profession strengthen a candidate's credentials but do not substitute for publishing or otherwise bringing research to fruition.

Meeting the publication and research criteria described above does not guarantee promotion and tenure. A candidate must also present evidence of balanced professional development in teaching, departmental and university service, collegiality, and, when appropriate, outreach.

2. Teaching

The candidate for tenure and/or promotion should work in a cooperative manner with other faculty to advance the teaching missions of the department, college, and university.

The History Department at Auburn takes particular pride in a lengthy tradition of outstanding teaching and highly values this skill in candidates. A candidate must submit documentation of teaching effectiveness. Such materials may include enrollment statistics, course syllabi, description of new courses offered, peer and self-assessment, student evaluations, examples of innovative approaches to teaching, the use of research or other scholarship in courses, letters from former students, exit interviews, participation in teaching workshops, and any other pertinent evidence. As one of several modes of evaluating teaching, student evaluations disclose useful information about a teacher's classroom demeanor and approaches but will not be construed as a straightforward quantitative measure of teaching effectiveness. College, university, or external teaching awards carry special weight in establishing a candidate's accomplishments in teaching.

3. Outreach

The candidate for tenure and/or promotion should work in a cooperative manner with other faculty to advance the outreach missions of the department, college, and university.

Outreach is defined as any activity that brings a department member into contact with public meetings, groups, or associations on the basis of that individual's scholarly expertise. Not every candidate will have an outreach assignment, but a candidate with outreach in his or her workload should provide documentation.

Some outreach activities are included in the category of non-traditional research, as defined under Research. Other outreach activities may include: Speaking to public groups, contacts in various capacities with museums, archives, or specialized library collections, and any other similar significant activity or endeavor that arises out of a candidate's scholarly standing. A candidate with a significant outreach assignment should fully document the activities and strive to measure their impact (numbers of persons addressed, numbers of participants in programs, numbers of persons logging on to a site, and any other data that pertains to the scope and influence of the activity described). Documentation of such activity enhances an application but does not supplant the requirements for published research unless the work involved clearly fits the standards for non-traditional research activities. When such work is deemed acceptable for partial fulfillment of research requirements, it must conform to the requirements described under Research.

4. Service

The candidate for tenure and/or promotion should work in a cooperative manner with other faculty to advance the service missions of the department, college, and university.

A candidate should submit evidence of service on department, school, and university committees or bodies such as the University Senate, as well as service to the profession. Although such activities enhance the resume, they do not substitute for a strong publication, teaching, and professional record of accomplishment.

5. Tenure

The criteria for attainment of tenured status are described in the *Faculty Handbook* (§3.9). Candidates for tenure in the Department of History are normally considered at the same time for promotion to the rank of associate professor; the recommendations are linked, in that favorable recommendation for tenure, with its more extensive requirements, presumes favorable recommendation for promotion to the rank of associate professor.

Applicability of These Guidelines

These standards for Tenure and Promotion apply to all members of the history faculty except those who at the time of its adoption are still on probationary appointment (i.e., pre-tenure faculty) or are associate professors seeking promotion to professor. Those faculty will be given the opportunity to opt-in to the guidelines by October 1, 2011. Those faculty who opt-in must provide their department chair a signed acceptance of the guidelines that states that they understand that the guidelines will be included in their promotion and tenure dossiers and used in the review of their dossiers.

These guidelines are immediately effective for subsequent employment and a copy of the guidelines must be provided to the candidate with the offer letter.