In the Department of History, decisions on retention of non-tenured faculty, on the award or denial of tenure, and on promotion are based upon evaluation of teaching, scholarship, and service to the Department, the College, the University, the profession, and the community. Decisions on retention of non-tenured faculty and on the award or denial of tenure will also take into consideration the faculty member’s potential for continuing development in each of these three areas.

Criteria for retention, tenure and promotion have been developed to reflect the existing mission of Georgia Southern University, the vision expressed in the University Strategic Plan, the American Historical Association’s model for evaluation of scholarship,¹ and the reality of expectations reflected in tenure and promotion decisions in history departments at peer institutions. These guidelines are not all inclusive. Working within these guidelines, faculty members make recommendations for tenure and promotion according to their best professional judgments.

SECTION 1: DEPARTMENT TENURE AND PROMOTION COMMITTEE AND EVALUATION PROCEDURES

The tenured faculty, with the exception of the Department Chair, will function as a committee of the whole to form the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee to evaluate and vote on candidates for third-year review, tenure, and promotion.

• All tenured faculty are eligible to vote on tenure decisions.
• Only faculty at the rank of associate professor and professor are eligible to vote on applications for promotion to associate professor.
• Only faculty at the rank of professor are eligible to vote on applications for promotion to professor.
• Candidates for promotion will not participate in any deliberation or vote on any recommendation concerning themselves.
• The Department Chair will schedule meetings on personnel matters, giving tenured faculty at least two weeks to review relevant documents. Faculty members should be notified of the meeting at least two weeks in advance.

**Subcommittees**
The review process will include peer evaluation of the candidate’s performance in all three areas: teaching, scholarship, and service. The evaluation will be conducted by a subcommittee of the Tenure and Promotion Committee consisting of:

- For third year review: three tenured faculty
- For tenure and promotion to associate professor: three tenured faculty at the rank of associate professor or professor
- For promotion to professor: three tenured faculty at the rank of professor

A separate subcommittee will be formed for each candidate under consideration. The Department Chair will select the members of the committee, in consultation with the candidate. Committees may consist entirely of members from the candidate’s home campus. When the Chair and the candidate have agreed on the composition of the committee, the Chair will notify the subcommittee members. If any member of the subcommittee is unable to serve, the Chair will notify the candidate before nominating a substitute. The subcommittee will develop a written evaluation, signed by all three members, to be included in the candidate’s dossier as part of the Department review. The Department Chair will appoint one member of the committee to serve as chair of the subcommittee, responsible for coordinating the final written report on behalf of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee and submitting it to the Department Chair by the appropriate deadline:

- For third year review: January 15
- For tenure and promotion to associate professor: September 1
- For promotion to professor: September 1

**Evaluation of teaching:** Each member of the subcommittee will arrange to visit at least one of the candidate’s classes at a time mutually agreeable to the candidate and the committee member. Subcommittee members need not attend the same class meeting and are encouraged to divide the observation duties so that both survey and upper-division classes are observed whenever possible. Subcommittee members shall also evaluate the candidate’s course material, for example any syllabus, handouts, examinations, and assignments. They should also take into consideration the candidate’s course development, as evidenced by a self-provided narrative, participation in teaching seminars or workshops, and/or the scholarship of teaching.

**Evaluation of scholarship:** Members of the subcommittee will each review samples of scholarly work submitted by the candidate and incorporate into their report an assessment of the candidate’s scholarly
work and publications.

*Evaluation of service:* The subcommittee will also include in its report a summary and evaluation of the candidate’s record of service to the Department, College, University, the profession, and the community.

*External Review*
Evaluation of candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor and candidates for promotion to professor will include evaluation of scholarship by external reviewers. The candidate, the Department Chair, and the chair of the subcommittee will agree on a list of four names of prospective reviewers.

Prospective reviewers should be scholars in the candidate’s field, although not former advisors or co-authors/collaborators, who can comment knowledgeably on the quality of the scholarship. The chair of the subcommittee will contact three people on the list and invite them to review submitted material. Once three people have agreed to do the review, no further inquiries will be made except by the Department Chair in the event of a missed deadline. The chair of the subcommittee will send to the reviewers the following materials:

- a cover letter based on the template at [https://docs.google.com/file/d/0BxetNtcoLOHBek5oaVQ4TjRyWDQ/edit](https://docs.google.com/file/d/0BxetNtcoLOHBek5oaVQ4TjRyWDQ/edit)
- a copy of the candidate’s *curriculum vitae*; and
- samples of work, published and/or unpublished, chosen in consultation with the candidate, the chair of the subcommittee, and the Department Chair

Materials for review should be mailed to the reviewers by May 1, and the deadline for their response will be August 1. Reports from external reviewers will be available to the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee and included in the candidate’s portfolio when submitted to the Dean.

*Voting Procedures*
The Department Chair or a substitute that s/he designates will conduct the meeting of the committee of the whole and will distribute appropriate ballots to each person present. Following discussion of the teaching, scholarship, and service of each candidate, all those present and eligible by tenure or rank will vote by secret ballot. A faculty member who cannot participate in the discussions because of illness or other pressing reasons may submit a proxy to the Department Chair prior to the meeting. All tenured faculty may vote on tenure. Only those at a rank or above may vote to promote a candidate to that rank (i.e., only Associate and Full Professors may vote to promote a candidate to Associate; only Full Professors may vote to promote a candidate to Full). The Department Chair will collect the ballots and select a faculty member to count the ballots while the Chair tallies them. The Chair will then report the results to the committee of the whole. If more than one candidate is being considered for retention, tenure, or promotion at a single meeting, the committee of the whole will discuss and vote on each candidate separately, but the ballots will not be counted until the committee has completed its deliberations on all candidates in the same category. The recommendation for each candidate to the Dean from the Tenure and Promotion Committee will include the results of the final vote and a list identifying voting faculty members (but not individual votes).
SECTION 2: EVALUATION OF TEACHING, SCHOLARSHIP, AND SERVICE

TEACHING
“Teaching represents professional activity directed toward the dissemination of knowledge and the development of critical thinking skills. Such activity typically involves teaching in the classroom, laboratory, or studio, and direction of research, ... mentoring, and the like. Teaching evaluation procedures should include both formative and summative elements. All teaching evaluation procedures should include student ratings of instruction and a narrative or self-evaluation that includes reflections of how professional pedagogical development (e.g., conferences/workshops on teaching and learning, course development) is applied. Further evidence of excellence in teaching can be found in classroom evaluations by peers and/or the department chair, examination of student work, as well as other evaluation methods not listed here.... Documentation of teaching effectiveness is the responsibility of the faculty member.”

(GSU Faculty Handbook 2018-2019, Section 306.01, Criteria for All Types of Faculty Evaluation)

Judgments of the quality of teaching activities will include consideration of:
- student ratings of instruction and peer evaluation through classroom observation and examination of syllabi and other relevant course materials;
- development of new courses and programs and/or ongoing enhancement and improvement of existing courses, and development of curricular materials;
- direction of undergraduate or graduate theses and participation on thesis/oral examination committees;
- participation in workshops, conferences, grants, and other programs designed to enhance and improve pedagogical skills;
- teaching off campus/field teaching;
- coordination of internships and mentoring of interns;
- creating/directing public history field schools.

Given the possibility of student biases against faculty members, as several recent studies have demonstrated, student ratings should not stand alone as an evaluation of classroom teaching, but must be used in conjunction with the materials listed above. In addition, faculty interaction with students often includes mentoring and forms of advisement beyond the work done by the dedicated Departmental advisor. As such, consideration of these activities should occur in the evaluation process.

SCHOLARSHIP
The significance of scholarly accomplishments shall be judged rigorously within the context of the discipline. Candidates must provide evidence of work which has been selected for dissemination through peer-reviewed venues such as publications, conference presentations, exhibitions, performances, or other professional accomplishments. Scholarship includes the discovery, integration, development, application, and extension of knowledge as well as aesthetic creation and is often demonstrated by publications and presentations designed for professional audiences. (GSU Faculty Handbook 2018-2019, Section 306.01, Criteria for All Types of Faculty Evaluation)

Ongoing scholarship and professional development are essential components of excellent teaching and central to the nurturing of the “teacher-scholar” model. Therefore, the Department of History expects every candidate for retention, tenure, and promotion to demonstrate a record of scholarly achievement, which may include but is not limited to:
- Major peer-reviewed publications in print, electronic media, or physical space, and/or
Smaller peer-reviewed publications in print, electronic media, or physical space
See Appendix I for a detailed list.

To account for any future innovations in research and the publication of scholarship, the Department also agrees to consider

- Any defensible original, peer-reviewed, scholarly work of significant length and quality not listed in the first section of Appendix I, and
- Any defensible original, peer-reviewed, scholarly work of significant quality, but shorter length, not listed in the second section of Appendix I.

The Department reaffirms the value of all types of scholarship listed above but recognizes that, in practice, a record of peer-reviewed publications, especially monographs and articles in scholarly journals and/or edited volumes, will be the primary consideration in the evaluation of scholarship. We also recognize that individual faculty members may follow different paths to establishing a record of scholarly publication. While each case will be judged independently, with the understanding that faculty arrive at Georgia Southern University with a wide range of experience and with an awareness that publication in some venues may reflect a work’s particular merit, the Department has established the following general guidelines for faculty.

**Candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor** should demonstrate a record of “Consistent and sustained peer-reviewed scholarship” (Section 320, CAH Policy and Procedures Manual). Emphasis will be placed on accomplishments since a faculty member’s arrival on campus. To this end, candidates should have a record of major scholarship, with a minimum of either three peer-reviewed articles or book chapters, or a monograph, or the public history equivalents (See Appendix I for further explanations). Any member of the Department who chooses may produce both public history and traditional academic scholarship.

**Candidates for promotion to professor** should possess a record of “Significant and sustained peer-reviewed scholarship ... demonstrating a commitment to a lifetime of productivity” (Section 320, CAH Policy and Procedures Manual). Emphasis will be placed upon accomplishments since promotion to associate professor. To this end, candidates should continue the record of major scholarship throughout their career. If the candidate produced a book prior to tenure and promotion to associate professor, that candidate should produce a further minimum of either three additional peer-reviewed articles or book chapters, or a monograph, or the public history equivalents. The guiding principle is that all full professors should have produced a monograph or its public history equivalent. (See Appendix I for a detailed, non-exhaustive list of scholarly output.)

Per College and University guidelines, candidates for promotion to senior lecturer are not required to demonstrate a record of peer-reviewed scholarship.

Candidates for tenure and/or promotion should provide evidence of their record of peer-reviewed scholarship and its significance, including but not limited to:

- Monographs in print and/or book manuscripts that have been accepted for publication with a peer-reviewed process, with all stages of review completed. For works not yet in print, candidates must submit a letter from the publisher in question confirming publication.
- Scholarly articles in peer-reviewed journals and/or edited volumes in print or accepted with no further revisions required. For works not yet at proof stage, candidates should include copies of the most recent documentation from the publisher stating that the article/book chapter is
completed and accepted, with proofs to follow at a later date.

- Supporting materials such as reviews (for books and book chapters), acceptance rates (for journals), and other useful background information.

See the College of Arts and Humanities guidelines for complete specifics regarding required documentation.

**SERVICE**

Faculty are expected to make service contributions to their professions and to the institution. Service at the Department/school, College, and University levels is essential to the well-being of the University. Service includes the application of one’s expertise in the discipline for the benefit of a professional organization, the community, or the institution. Service also includes the academic advisement of Georgia Southern University students. Additionally, service may include work in schools, businesses, museums, social agencies, government, etc., as well as activities undertaken on behalf of the University. Consulting shall be designated as paid or unpaid. (GSU Faculty Handbook 2018-2019, Section 306.01, Criteria for All Types of Faculty Evaluation)

Every member of the Department of History is expected to serve the Department, the University, the larger academic community, and the general public. As a faculty member aspires to higher rank, service contributions should expand beyond the Department to the University and the degree of service to the profession should increase. Service entails being a “good citizen” — willingly shouldering one’s responsibilities as a member of a community of teachers and scholars and as a representative of a university with a longstanding tradition of service. Service includes but is not limited to:

**Service to the campus:**
- service on Departmental, College, and University committees, or on the Faculty Senate;
- academic advisement of Georgia Southern students
- special assignments within the Department, such as liaison with other Colleges, student recruitment, coordinating outreach programs, editing the Department newsletter, etc.;
- advising student organizations;
- recruiting students;
- serving as webmaster;
- directing the Public History program.

**Service to the community:**
- presentation of programs and workshops on campus and in the community;
- receipt of honors and awards recognizing service to the community;
- meeting with and fostering relationships with potential program partners;
- giving public talks/lectures;
- giving original tours;
- having a major role in community projects of historical interest.

**Service to the profession:**
- book reviews in academic journals; book reviews written for electronic media if they are subject to the same scrutiny and professional editing as scholarship in print; historical articles in popular publications such as newspapers, magazines, etc.;
- offices and committee memberships in local, state, regional, and national professional...
associations;
• professional consulting such as reviewing manuscripts for presses and journals; service as editor or book review editor of scholarly journals or electronic publications;
• design and development of professional conferences;
• contributing one’s professional expertise in projects with schools, businesses, museums, and the like;
• being interviewed by the media as an expert;
• receipt of professional honors and awards recognizing service to the profession;
• consulting on public history or history issues for an institution, museum, community group or public history business;
• giving expert testimony/litigation that furthers the interest of historical scholarship;
• consulting on restoration, preservation, exhibition, and other cultural resource management projects;
• writing peer-reviews for physical and digital exhibits, archives, museums, film, institution histories and other public history products;
• writing grants for historical institutions;
• producing public history teaching material for middle/high school teachers or school districts;
• writing a nomination for a historical site/sign nomination and writing the text for that site or sign;
• consulting on public history or history issues for an institution, museum, community group or public history business, and producing an article length report for said institution.

SECTION 3: EVALUATION PROCEDURES FOR THIRD-YEAR REVIEW OF PROBATIONARY TENURE-TRACK FACULTY AND LECTURERS

In accordance with Section 310 of the CAH Policy and Procedures Manual, the Department conducts a comprehensive review of achievements and performance in the third year of the probationary period as a basis for recommending renewal or nonrenewal of the contract beyond the following year. In those cases where the faculty member has prior years’ service toward tenure, the review is conducted at the midpoint of the remaining probationary period.

Candidates for pre-tenure and/or third-year review will be notified by August 15 of the academic year in which the review is to be conducted. Each candidate for third-year review shall submit the following materials, excepting those listed as “to be inserted by the Department Chair,” to the Department Chair by January 15:

1. A copy of the chair’s evaluation of the faculty member’s progress toward tenure and promotion (to be inserted by the Department Chair).
2. A copy of the Department pre-tenure review committee’s evaluation of the faculty member (to be inserted by the Department Chair).
3. An up-to-date curriculum vitae in approved format. While works in progress or submitted works may be separately listed, works in press must be accompanied by a letter from the journal or publisher.
4. A personal narrative of accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service.
5. Annual reviews and any documents or information produced in response to such reviews.
7. Evidence of peer evaluation of instruction (to be inserted by the Department Chair).
8. Evidence of service activities and (for lecturers) of professional development during the review period.
9. The faculty member’s written response to the Departmental review, if any.
10. A list of accompanying supplemental material.
11. Other supporting materials that the applicant believes will strengthen the application.

Items 1-10 will be submitted electronically, according to the College policies. Candidates should consult the CAH Pre-Tenure Review Checklist, available at http://cah.georgiasouthern.edu/facstaff/policies/.

The evaluation, the composition and duties of the subcommittee, the meeting of the committee of the whole, the vote, and final written recommendation from the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee will be conducted in accordance with procedures outlined in Section 1. The candidate’s review subcommittee will develop a written evaluation, signed by all three members, to be submitted to the Department Chair by the January 15 deadline. This evaluation will be included in the candidate’s dossier as part of the review.

The Department Chair will notify each candidate of the Department’s recommendation and will discuss with the candidate suggestions for future progress and professional development. The Department Chair shall give the faculty member a written summary of the review and any suggestions for continued progress, discuss the report with the faculty member by February 1. The faculty member may provide a written response, which will be appended to the written report, by February 10. Both parties shall sign the report to indicate that they have discussed it. The Department Chair shall then forward the recommendation of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee, along with the required materials submitted by the candidate according to Section 310 of the CAH Policy and Procedures Manual, to the Dean by February 15.

Like the annual review, the third-year review of lecturers in the History Department remains the purview of the Department Chair (as per BoR/GSU policy). Nevertheless, the third-year review process outlined above is designed to advise and make a recommendation to the Department Chair, as well as to inform the Department as a whole, regarding a lecturer’s progress toward possible promotion to senior lecturer.

Members of the faculty, whether tenure-track or lecturers, may appeal negative decisions via grievance procedures specified in the University Faculty Handbook (section 313). Notification of non-reappointment of a lecturer or senior lecturer must be provided “as early as possible” following the schedule in the Handbook (section 306.02).

A positive pre-tenure or third-year review is not a guarantee of tenure and/or promotion.

SECTION 4: EVALUATION PROCEDURES FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR AND FOR RENEWAL AS LECTURER OR PROMOTION TO SENIOR LECTURER

Tenure evaluations will be conducted in accordance with procedures outlined in Section 320 of the CAH Policy and Procedures Manual and Section 2 of this document. Evaluations for renewal as lecturer or promotion to senior lecturer will be conducted in accordance with procedures outlined in Section 302 of the CAH Policy and Procedures Manual and Section 2 of this document.
Faculty wishing to apply for tenure and promotion to associate professor, and lecturers wishing to apply for renewal and/or promotion to senior lecturer, should notify the Department Chair by April 1 of the year during which the application will be submitted. Each candidate for tenure and promotion shall submit the following materials, excepting those listed as “to be inserted by the Department Chair,” by September 1:

1. Required cover materials, including a completed promotion and/or tenure application form, or a lecturer reappointment/promotion application form (to be inserted by the Department Chair).
2. A cover letter from the Department Chair detailing the Chair’s recommendation to the dean on the faculty member’s candidacy for reappointment, promotion and/or tenure (to be inserted by the Department Chair).
3. A copy of the Department committee’s memorandum on promotion and tenure or reappointment and promotion to the Department Chair regarding the candidate (to be inserted by the Department Chair).
4. An up-to-date curriculum vitae in approved format. While works in progress or submitted works may be separately listed, works in press must be accompanied by a letter from the journal or publisher.
5. A personal narrative of accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service or (for lecturers) professional development.
6. A copy of the third year or pre-tenure Review.
7. Annual reviews and any documents or information produced in response to such reviews.
8. Summary of student ratings of instruction.
9. Evidence of peer evaluation of instruction (to be inserted by the Department Chair).
10. External letters of evaluation of scholarship (to be inserted by the Department Chair) or (for lecturers) of service activities during the review period.
11. A list of accompanying supplemental material.
12. Other supporting materials that the applicant believes will strengthen the application.

Items 1 through 11 will be submitted electronically, according to College policies, with supporting materials submitted separately. Candidates seeking promotion and tenure in the same year need only submit one set of required and supporting materials to the dean.

The evaluation, the composition and duties of the subcommittee, the meeting of the committee of the whole, the vote, and final written recommendation from the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee will be conducted in accordance with procedures outlined in Section 1. The Department Chair will submit the Recommendation for Tenure and Promotion form, the recommendation of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee, and the candidate’s required materials listed in Section 320, Part D, of the CAH Policy and Procedures Manual, to the Dean by October 1.

In accordance with university policy, all applications for tenure and promotion, once submitted, will advance through the Dean’s Office and the Provost’s Office for review, even if the Department recommends against tenure. The Department Chair will notify each candidate of the Department’s recommendation and will discuss with the candidate suggestions for future progress and professional development.

Lecturer candidates for promotion and reappointment beyond the sixth year, and tenure-track...
candidates for promotion and tenure, may appeal a negative decision following the process outlined in the GSU Faculty Handbook (315.04).

Notification of non-reappointment of lecturers will be provided as early as possible but no later than the schedule outlined by Board of Regents' policy 8.3.4.3:

- For lecturers or senior lecturers with less than three years of full-time service, institutions are encouraged to provide non-reappointment notice as early as possible, but no specific notice is required.
- For lecturers or senior lecturers with three or more years but less than six years of full-time service, institutions must provide non-reappointment notice at least 30 calendar days prior to the institution's first day of classes in the semester.
- For lecturers or senior lecturers with six years or more of full-time service, institutions must provide non-reappointment notice at least 180 calendar days prior to the institution’s first day of classes in the semester.

Lecturers or senior lecturers who have served for six or more years of full-time service as a lecturer at the institution and who have received timely notice of non-reappointment shall be entitled to a review of the decision in accordance with published procedures of Georgia Southern University per Board of Regents’ policy 8.3.4.3.

**Promotion to Senior Lecturer**

According to CAH Policy 302.C, Lecturers who are in their fifth or sixth year of service at the institution and who demonstrate a sustained record of noteworthy achievement may be considered for promotion to senior lecturer (Board of Regents policy 8.3.8.2; Georgia Southern University Faculty Handbook 315.03). In the College of Arts and Humanities, a faculty member must be promoted to the rank of senior lecturer to be eligible for continuation beyond the initial five or six-year period. To be promoted to senior lecturer, annual performance reviews and other supporting evidence are required to show noteworthy achievement in teaching and a sustained record of service to the institution. Together, noteworthy achievement in teaching and a sustained record of service mean a consistent record of "exceptional teaching ability and extraordinary value to the institution." (Board of Regents’ policy 8.3.8.2).

For the purposes of promotion to senior lecturer and reappointment beyond the initial five or six years, the following definitions apply in the College of Arts and Humanities (CAH Policy 302.C):

- "exceptional teaching ability": The faculty member shows a record of consistently exceeding Departmental expectations for competency in teaching and demonstrates a clear commitment to successful and engaging interaction with students in which the focus is on student gains in skills, knowledge, understanding, and personal growth.
- "extraordinary value to the institution": The faculty member shows a record of consistent contribution to the institution through professional development and a sustained commitment to service, demonstrating an active involvement in the operation and governance of the Department, College, and/or University.

For the Department of History, contributions that can provide evidence of a lecturer’s “extraordinary value” may include (but are not limited to):

- service to the Department, College, University, profession or community;
- active participation in Department governance and other participation in Department activities,
as outlined above;
• professional development as an instructor via workshops, specialized training, online course
development, etc.;
• presentations at regional, national, and international professional conferences;
• professional consulting or contributing professional expertise in projects with schools,
businesses, museums, etc.;
• being interviewed by the media as an expert;
• offices and committee memberships in professional associations;
• publication of book reviews, which are treated as service to the profession.

In the History Department, when a lecturer is being considered for promotion to senior lecturer, the
History Department Chair, paralleling the procedure in the professorial ranks, will appoint a Lecturer
Reappointment and Promotion Subcommittee that will consist of three or more tenured faculty and
senior lecturers (when possible) chosen in consultation with the Department Chair. Tenured faculty
must make up the majority membership of this subcommittee. When the Chair and the candidate have
agreed on the composition of the committee, the Chair will notify the subcommittee members. If any
member of the subcommittee is unable to serve, the Chair will notify the candidate before nominating a
substitute.

Appeals
Candidates for promotion and reappointment, or promotion and tenure, may appeal a negative decision
following the process outlined in the Faculty Handbook (section 313), with the following stipulations:
• “In keeping with Board of Regent’s policy, promotion to senior lecturer requires approval by the
President. Reappointment procedures for senior lecturers follow the same reappointment
procedures as those for lecturers” (Faculty Handbook section 315.03).
• “Since promotion and tenure decisions are made at the president’s level, appeals can only be
filed following the President’s decision (in late January or early February). Faculty may write a
letter responding to a negative recommendation received at an earlier level of review and ask
that this letter be included in their promotion and/or tenure dossier as it proceeds through the
various levels of review, but the letter is not considered a formal appeal. Formal appeals must
be made to the President through the Provost’s Office within 14 days of notification of the
decision.” (CAH Policy and Procedures Manual 320.F)

A favorable recommendation by the Department of History does not guarantee tenure and promotion to
associate professor or promotion to senior lecturer. Final approval rests with the President.

SECTION 5: EVALUATION PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

Evaluations for promotion will be conducted in accordance with the procedures outlined in Section 320
of the CAH Policy and Procedures Manual and Section 2 of this document.

Candidates for promotion should be aware that “[p]romotions in rank are based on merit and are not
automatic” (GSU Faculty Handbook, Section 311, Promotion Guidelines). Candidates for promotion to
professor must show excellence in teaching, a demonstrated and sustained record of scholarly
achievement, and outstanding service to the institution.
Faculty wishing to apply for promotion should notify the Department Chair by April 1 of the year during which the application will be submitted. After consultation with the Department Chair, each candidate for promotion to professor shall submit the following materials, excepting those listed as “to be inserted by the Department Chair,” by September 1:

1. Required cover materials, including a completed promotion application form (to be inserted by the Department Chair).
2. A cover letter from the Department Chair detailing the Chair’s recommendation to the dean on the faculty member’s candidacy for promotion (to be inserted by the Department Chair).
3. A copy of the Department promotion and tenure committee’s memorandum to the Department Chair regarding the candidate (to be inserted by the Department Chair).
4. An up-to-date curriculum vitae in approved format. While works in progress or submitted works may be separately listed, works in press must be accompanied by a letter from the journal or publisher.
5. A personal narrative of accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service.
6. Tenure Review.
7. Annual reviews and any documents or information produced in response to such reviews.
8. Summary of student ratings of instruction.
9. Evidence of peer evaluation of instruction (to be inserted by the Department Chair).
10. External letters of evaluation of scholarship (to be inserted by the Department Chair).
11. A list of accompanying supplemental material.
12. Other supporting materials that the applicant believes will strengthen the application.

Items 1 through 11 will be submitted electronically, according to College procedure, with supporting materials submitted separately.

The evaluation, the composition and duties of the subcommittee, the meeting of the committee of the whole, the vote, and final written recommendation from the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee will be conducted in accordance with procedures outlined in Section 1.

The Department Chair will notify each candidate of the Department’s recommendation. If the recommendation is favorable, the Department Chair will submit the Recommendation for Promotion form, the recommendation of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee, and the candidate’s required materials listed in Section 320, Part E, of the CAH Policy and Procedures Manual, to the Dean by October 1. If the recommendation is unfavorable, the Department Chair will discuss with the candidate suggestions for future progress and professional development. In either case, any application for promotion, once submitted, will advance to the Dean’s Office and the Provost’s Office for review.

A favorable recommendation by the Department of History does not guarantee promotion. The final decision rests with the President.

Appeal Procedure
Promotion and tenure decisions are made at the president’s level, so appeals can only be filed following the President’s decision (in late January or early February) and within fourteen (14) days of notification of the decision. Faculty who wish to respond to a negative recommendation at an earlier level of review may write a letter responding to that evaluation and ask that the letter be included in their dossier for the next levels of review, but the letter is not considered a formal appeal.
SECTION 6: EVALUATION PROCEDURE FOR POST-TENURE REVIEW AND FOR MAJOR REVIEW OF SENIOR LECTURER

Evaluations for Post-Tenure Review will be conducted in accordance with the procedures outlined by Section 330 of the CAH Policy and Procedures Manual. The post-tenure review occurs in the College rather than in the Department.

Upon notification from the Dean’s Office, a faculty member undergoing five-year post-tenure review will solicit three faculty in the Department of equal or higher rank to conduct a peer evaluation of teaching, to be completed by December 15. The faculty member will then submit the following materials, excepting those listed as “to be inserted by the Department Chair,” to the Department Chair by January 15:

1. A Department Chair’s evaluation specifically written for the purpose of the post-tenure review (to be inserted by the Department Chair).
2. A current curriculum vitae in standard format, highlighting review period.
3. Copies of annual performance reviews for review period.
4. The results of the faculty member’s most recent major personnel evaluation (tenure, promotion, or previous post-tenure) by the Department.
5. Summaries of student ratings of instruction for the review period.
6. Evidence of peer evaluation of instruction (to be inserted by the Department Chair).
7. Self-evaluation narrative with projected goals.

Items 1-7 will be submitted electronically, according to College procedure, with supporting materials, if any, submitted separately.

This portfolio will be submitted by the Department Chair to the Dean’s Office by February 1. Upon completion of the review, the Dean’s Office will forward a copy of the review report to the faculty member and the Department Chair. The Department Chair will work with the faculty member to continue progress toward promotion and/or meeting any recommendations made in the review.

Major Review of Senior Lecturers
CAH Policy 302.E requires a major review of lecturers after their promotion to senior lecturer (if applicable), to be undertaken every five years. This review parallels post-tenure reviews in the professorial ranks and as such “focuses on continuing a mutually beneficial relationship between the institution and individual in order to provide development opportunities and to recognize, reward, and enhance faculty performance.” For the major review of senior lecturers, a review committee, comprised of three or more tenured faculty members (who must be the majority) and senior lecturers (when available), will conduct this major review and report the results of its evaluation in writing to the Department Chair.

A senior lecturer undergoing a five-year major review will submit the following materials (excepting those items to be inserted by the Department Chair) to the Department Chair by January 15:

1. The Department Chair’s evaluation specifically written for the purpose of the major review;
2. The Department review subcommittee’s report to the Department Chair;
3. A current curriculum vitae in standard format, highlighting the review period;
4. Copies of annual performance reviews for the review period;
5. Summary of student ratings of instruction for the review period;
6. Evidence of peer evaluation of instruction;
7. Evidence of service activities during the review period;
8. Self-evaluation narrative with projected goals.

Items 1-8 will be submitted electronically, according to College procedure, with supporting materials, if any, submitted separately.

The Department Chair will, by February 1 of the review year, submit these materials to the CAH Dean, to be evaluated in accord with CAH Policy 302.E.

The Department’s policies and procedures supplement but do not supersede any provisions of the University Faculty Handbook or the College of Arts and Humanities Policy and Procedures Manual, nor do they constitute a contractual commitment on the part of the College or the University.

SECTION 7: PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION

The Department Chair will evaluate each faculty member’s performance (teaching, scholarship, and service) for the calendar year in accordance with guidelines in Section 300 of the CAH Policy and Procedures Manual. This review will be used to evaluate progress toward tenure and promotion, to evaluate teaching loads, and for annual merit increases.

Each faculty member will submit, by the end of the first week of class of the spring semester, his or her Faculty Report of Activity via the link available on the College web site. Faculty members may also submit an optional narrative self-reflection in the form of a memorandum to the Chair. The Chair will complete the Annual Evaluation Form for each faculty member.

Untenured faculty members who are not undergoing a mid-term or promotion review will be observed in the classroom by a tenured Departmental colleague once per year. The observer will produce a memorandum to be considered by the Chair as part of the annual evaluation of teaching. The memorandum should be formative and constructive, and should be provided to both the candidate and the Chair. Candidates may choose from members of the Department in consultation with the Chair. Observers may consist entirely of members from the candidate’s home campus. Individual observers will not undertake more than two observations per year for this purpose.

The Chair will meet individually with each Faculty member and review the Annual Evaluation Form. The following procedures will guide the Annual Faculty Review process:

- The faculty member’s effectiveness as a teacher and participation in development opportunities will be given special importance.
- At the evaluation meeting, the faculty member will be shown the Department Chairs’ written evaluation of his or her performance for the past year.
- The faculty member signs the evaluation, indicating that he or she has seen its contents (not necessarily that he or she agrees with the evaluation itself).
- The faculty member may choose to append a written response to the department Chair’s evaluation.
- The Department Chair prepares a photocopy of the signed evaluation with its appended response (if any) and sends the copy to the faculty member.
• The original signed evaluation with its appended response (if any) becomes a permanent part of the faculty member’s departmental personnel file.
• A second copy of the signed evaluation with its appended response (if any) is forwarded to the Dean’s Office where it becomes a permanent part of the faculty member’s College-level personnel file.
• It is also acceptable for Department to prepare three original copies of the evaluation for the faculty member. In this case, all three copies should be signed. The three copies should be distributed as follows: to the faculty member, to the faculty member’s departmental file, and to the faculty member’s College-level personnel file.

The faculty member’s effectiveness in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service will be assigned into one of the following categories: Extraordinarily exceeds stated expectations; Exceeds stated expectations; Fully meets stated expectations; Partially meets stated expectations; Does not meet stated expectations.

While it is impossible to provide a precise definition for each of these categories, the following is offered for general guidance (in all cases examples are provided merely for the sake of illustration):

Does not meet stated expectations: The quality and quantity of the faculty member’s work have been totally unsatisfactory. This category should be used rarely and should imply that immediate correction is imperative.
• Teaching: A few examples of failing to meet expectations in teaching include: (a) frequently missed classes, (b) consistent failure to conduct office hours, (c) consistent receipt of extremely poor student ratings of instruction or peer reviews.
• Scholarship/Research/Creative Activity: May be used to indicate that the faculty member has not performed even the minimal amount of scholarly activity needed to remain current in his or her field, a consistent lack of interest in issues related to the discipline, or failure to remain adequately informed about the discipline beyond the level required for basic class preparation.
• Service: Either failure to perform any significant service activity or performance of such activity only with extreme reluctance.

Partially meets stated expectations: The faculty member’s work is not satisfactory in quantity or quality. This category indicates that the individual is not performing at an adequate level and that corrective actions are required.
• Teaching: A few examples of teaching that partially meets expectations include: (a) being frequently unprepared for class, (b) regularly missing office hours, (c) consistently receiving poor student ratings of instruction or peer reviews.
• Scholarship/Research/Creative Activity: May be used to indicate that the faculty member shows little enthusiasm and seldom participates in professional events such as lectures, symposia, and workshops in order to remain current in his or her field. Also may indicate that the faculty member is not engaged in professional activities at a level consistent with other members of the Department.
• Service: An example of service that partially meets expectations might include a willingness to serve on committees to which the faculty member is appointed but making no special effort to carry out assigned charges.

Fully meets stated expectations: The quantity and quality of the faculty member’s work are being produced at a level fully meeting all departmental expectations. Tasks are being accomplished in a timely and competent manner. The faculty member is meeting the high standards set by the
Department. The descriptor “fully meets stated expectations” is in no way meant to imply that the faculty member is only average or meeting departmental expectations in a merely adequate fashion. Rather, the rank of fully acceptable means that the faculty member should be commended for fully satisfying the rigorous standards of both the Department and the College.

**Exceeds stated expectations:** The faculty member’s work exceeds the level of satisfactory in both quality and quantity. The faculty member is a productive colleague and should be highly commended. The faculty member often exceeds goals and expectations.

- **Teaching.** A few examples of exceeding stated expectations in teaching include: (a) always conducting classes with obvious imagination and enthusiasm, (b) repeatedly introducing new developments or other successful techniques into courses, (c) being consistently and frequently recognized by both students and colleagues as an outstanding teacher.
- **Scholarship/Research/Creative Activity.** A few examples of exceeding stated expectations in professional activity include: (a) remaining highly current in one’s field through frequent presentation of papers at significant professional meetings or by other appropriate means, including applying for competitive grants, developing historical markers, and scholarly collaborations as reflected in the guidelines established by the American Historical Association; (b) creativity and high success at carrying out scholarly activities appropriate for both the discipline and the Department.
- **Service.** Some examples of exceeding stated expectations in service include being: (a) widely regarded as highly effective in Department, College, and University service activities, (b) consistently selected to work on important programs at the Department, College, and University level, (c) frequently selected to chair important committees at the Department, College, and University level.

**Extraordinarily exceeds stated expectations:** The faculty member is considered to be one of the very best in the Department, College, and University by students and colleagues alike. The faculty member meets and consistently far exceeds the criteria for a rating of “exceeds stated expectations” This distinction should rarely be given and should indicate that the faculty member is widely considered a “star” (i.e., in the top 5% or better) for the category being evaluated.

- **Teaching.** Extraordinary teaching is demonstrated, for instance, by the faculty member who wins recognition for quality of instruction at the university, state, regional, national, and/or international level.
- **Scholarship/Research/Creative Activity.** A few examples of extraordinary professional activity include: (a) production of a new, book-length work or research project that is exhaustively peer-reviewed and published by a major, internationally recognized press; (b) completion of a major creative work that receives recognition for research or scholarly activity at a level not less than university-wide; (c) receipt of a major competitive grant.
- **Service.** An example of extraordinary service might be a long and distinguished history or using the faculty member’s professional expertise to perform uncompensated services directed toward improving the quality of life for the local, state, national, or international community.

**Annual Evaluations of Lecturers**
The *Faculty Handbook* states that “Every lecturer and senior lecturer shall have an annual review conducted along the same schedule as individuals in the professorial ranks. Any additional requirements for departmental input or constitution of the review committee may be adopted by the individual department and/or college in which they are appointed. For lecturers, annual performance reviews
should show achievement in teaching and achievement in at least one of the following areas: (1) service; (2) professional growth and development. The faculty in each unit and College should establish its own formal review process (mechanisms and policies) for lecturers and senior lecturers, including definitions of ‘exceptional teaching ability,’ ‘extraordinary value to the institution,’ and ‘noteworthy achievement’” (Faculty Handbook, Section 315.02).

CAH policy adds, “Lecturers and senior lecturers shall have an annual review conducted by the Department Chair along the same schedule as individuals in the professorial ranks. For lecturers, annual performance reviews should evaluate performance in the areas of teaching, service, and professional development. These annual evaluations will be used for determination of merit increases (when available) and for decisions concerning reappointment and promotion” (CAH Policy 302.B).

The required annual review of lecturers in the History Department is the purview of the Department Chair, who shall keep to the general procedures outlined in this document, but following evaluation criteria appropriate to the position of lecturer. This includes the aforementioned BoR/GSU proviso that lecturers “have the presumption of reappointment for the subsequent academic year” following the initial probationary first year.

Further, the Department recommends that the Chair meet regularly with each lecturer to describe this review policy and Departmental expectations of the position, and to remind the faculty member that excellence in teaching will receive the highest priority in annual and major reviews.

In all cases, the faculty member will sign the evaluation, indicating that he or she has seen its contents (not necessarily that he or she agrees with the evaluation itself). The faculty member may choose to append a written response to the Chair’s evaluation. A copy of the signed evaluation with its appended response (if any) will be given to the faculty member. The signed evaluation with its appended response (if any) will be placed in the faculty member’s Departmental personnel file. A copy of the signed evaluation with its appended response (if any) will be forwarded to the Dean for review and placement in the faculty member’s College-level personnel file. Annual merit increase recommended by the Chair will reflect the annual performance evaluation of each faculty member.

For more detailed information on annual evaluation, see Section 300 of the CAH Policy and Procedures Manual.

SECTION 8: EMERITUS STATUS

According to the University Handbook, Section 218.06, “Emeritus/a status is granted to encourage continued association with the University for the purposes of university service, instruction, and scholarly investigation.” The President of the University awards the honorary title to “full-time faculty and/or administrative officers who, at the time of retirement, had 10 or more years of honorable and distinguished University System of Georgia service.”

Nominations of retirees for emeritus/a status originate with the Chair of the Department and must be approved by the dean. Criteria for nomination, in addition to the required service, include:

- a consistent record of distinction in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service;
- recognition of that record from the institution and/or professional associations;
- contributions to the community and profession; and
endorsement by a majority vote from the faculty of the Department.

Should the Chair and Dean determine that a retiree qualifies for emeritus/a status, they will initiate the application for emeritus/a (found at http://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/forms/) status by nominating the candidate. The nomination should consist of a letter of recommendation detailing the fitness of the candidate for emeritus/a status. Spring applications are due in the Provost’s Office no later than February 15th. Summer/fall applications are due no later than September 15th. The final decision rests with the President, who will inform the candidate and Department Chair of this decision and ask them to complete the Emeriti Designation Packet (found at http://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/forms/).
Appendix I: Supplemental information on Scholarship

The Department recognizes multiple kinds of scholarship, and herein presents a list of items organized by type, with illustrative examples not designed to be exhaustive. “Published” in all cases includes print and electronic formats. Minor scholarship alone will not be considered sufficient to earn tenure or promotion, but should be delineated in annual reviews and will be used as evidence of continued commitment to the teacher/scholar model. This list is subject to change as new platforms for research presentation are developed.

Section 1. Major Scholarship:

- Scholarly, peer-reviewed monographs or textbooks and their public history equivalents, including feature-length films (75 minutes or longer) that have been accepted for national/international broadcast or accepted by a major juried film festival, major physical exhibits at nationally or internationally accredited institution, which may include museums, historical sites, parks, libraries or other historical institutions\(^2\); 60,000+ word institutional histories or books for a public audience that speak about the field of public history in a significant way; and large-scale, single authored, peer-reviewed, original historical research, including state and federal reports;
- Scholarly, peer-reviewed articles in scholarly journals, chapters in edited volumes, including those in volumes edited by the candidate, and peer-reviewed published proceedings;
- peer-reviewed original tours;
- short films (74 minutes or less) accepted for broadcast or accepted by a juried film festival;
- creating smaller physical and digital exhibits at accredited museums and other institutions with exhibit space/cases like universities, \(^3\) hotels, business centers, banks, and other community centers;
- lengthy (at least 6,000 words) entries in peer- or editorially-reviewed reference works such as encyclopedias or biographical dictionaries, and translations of lengthy primary sources or monographs when accompanied by editorial apparatus which requires the expertise of the Department member;
- receipt of research grants, or of honors and awards for scholarly contributions;
- major editorial/curatorial writing for an exhibit, or archive; or creating a digital exhibit;
- producing public history teaching material for middle/high school teachers or school districts, writing a nomination for a historical site/sign nomination and writing the text for that site or sign; and consulting on public history or history issues for an institution, museum, community group or public history business, and producing an article length report for said institution; and
- Co-authored scholarly, peer-reviewed publications including books and articles; and editorially reviewed articles, review essays, or chapters.

---

\(^2\) Major exhibits should be not less than 3,000 square feet of exhibit space. Consideration should include the final exhibit and all of the smaller products that make up an exhibit, including exhibit labels, educational programing, exhibit catalogues, interactive materials, webpages, bibliographies, media, research, and grant applications.

\(^3\) This may include the campuses of Georgia Southern University, provided that such exhibits are primarily the work of the faculty member, not students, have undergone scholarly review, and fill an exhibit space of at least 600 sq. ft. As with major exhibits, consideration should include the final exhibit and all of the smaller products that make up an exhibit.
Section 2. Minor Scholarship:

- presentations and panel participation at academic conferences and professional meetings;
- encyclopedia articles which do not require primary source research and/or which are shorter than 6,000 words;
- editing or co-editing a volume in which the Department member is not a contributor;
- publications based on the Department member’s scholarship which are not subject to peer or editorial review; and
- translations of scholarly articles with no additional input from the Department member.