

KU DEPARTMENT
OF HISTORY

**College of Liberal Arts
& Sciences**

BYLAWS

Updated: April 17, 2019

History Bylaws

Table of Contents

I.	Mission, Vision, and Values	1
II.	Department Meetings and Membership.....	2
III.	Chairperson	4
IV.	Department Officers.....	7
V.	Faculty Appointments	10
VI.	Other Appointments.....	14
VII.	Appointment to Regular Department Committees	15
VIII.	Student Representation on Committees	16
IX.	Undergraduate Committee	17
X.	Graduate Committee	18
XI.	Governance Committee	19
XII.	Outreach Committee	21
XIII.	Faculty Executive Board.....	22
XIV.	Subject-Area Caucuses	23
XV.	Review and Oversight of Department Officers, Committees, and Operations	23
XVI.	Teaching, Advising, and Scheduling Responsibilities.....	24
XVII.	Faculty Personnel Files	27
XVIII.	Student Academic Misconduct	28
XIX.	Grade Appeals.....	29
XX.	Amendments to Bylaws	30
	Appendix A: Progress Toward Tenure Review Procedures	31
	Appendix B: Promotion and Tenure Criteria and Procedures	33
	Appendix C: Post-tenure Review Criteria and Procedures.....	44
	Appendix D: Faculty Evaluation Criteria and Procedures.....	49
	Appendix E: Grievance Procedures	71
	Appendix F: Promotion Criteria for Teaching Professors	76

I. Mission, Vision, and Values

“Our past is your future....”

A. Mission

As a nationally and internationally prominent department at a major research university, KU historians appreciate the complexity and diversity of the human experience, question simple explanations, evaluate evidence in multiple forms, and offer insightful interpretations with clarity of expression. We

- Produce excellent scholarship that expands the boundaries of history.
- Mentor the next generation of historians through our MA and PhD programs.
- Educate undergraduate students about the value of intellectual curiosity, empathetic and critical thinking, and historical understanding.

The Department of History seeks to work with others across KU, throughout the country, and around the world to foster understanding of the complex origins of today’s world and its challenges and to aid in intelligent decision-making about the future.

B. Vision

We aspire to be a leading student-centered, research-intensive department that attracts and retains talented and intellectually curious students from across Kansas and beyond. We aim to have strong faculty and staff members who contribute to the department, the University, the community, and the world through the excellence of our teaching, research, and service. We seek to provide a welcoming, supportive environment for learning and working where differences are valued and all persons are offered an equitable opportunity to achieve their academic and professional goals.

C. Values

We believe that a critical understanding of the past is foundational to a sustainable future in which social and cultural diversity is appreciated. We accomplish our mission through the lens of shared values. Our goal is to be:

- Driven by excellence.
- Committed to the advancement of historical scholarship
- Creative, critical, and comparative thinkers.
- Committed to honor diversity in our classrooms, department, campus, and community.
- Proactive in efforts to promote an equitable and inclusive environment for all.
- Transparent and inclusive in our governance.
- Service oriented.
- Fiscally responsible.

II. Department Meetings and Membership

A. Powers of the Department

The department recognizes that it is bound in its action by University regulations, particularly as expressed in the *Handbook for Faculty and Other Unclassified Staff*. Reference should be made to these regulations in all cases since the bylaws and other policies and practices of the department are supplementary to the main body of University regulation.

B. Conduct of Departmental Meetings

Within the limits imposed by these bylaws, the Chairperson of the department shall conduct departmental meetings in the manner most likely to ensure free, open, and orderly discussion. When questions of procedure arise, appeal should be made to the latest edition of *Robert's Rules of Order*.

C. Scheduling of Departmental Meetings

Before the beginning of classes each semester, the Chairperson will typically schedule five regular departmental meetings (including the annual convocation), to be held at three- to four-week intervals over the course of the semester. Except in exceptional circumstances announced well in advance, these meetings will be held from 4 to 5pm on Tuesdays and last no more than one hour.

D. Membership

Voting members of the department shall consist of those holding tenure-track professorships, teaching professorships, and other continuing multi-year appointments in the department (such as lecturers or visiting professors), as well as those students who have been duly elected or appointed as representatives to the department. The voting membership will be confined to persons holding tenure-track or continuing multi-year appointments in the department for final hiring decisions, promotion and tenure recommendations, faculty and student evaluation, policies governing student academic standards, and other matters explicitly delimited by departmental bylaws. Student representatives cannot vote on these matters, and in some cases do not attend meetings in which these matters are discussed. Professors *emeriti* of the department are encouraged to participate in meetings in an advisory capacity, but do not have a voting role.

E. Student Representation

1. At departmental meetings, the number of student representatives will be determined as follows: students will represent a number less than or equal to 20 percent of the permanent faculty. Two of these voting members will be undergraduates; the balance of these voting members will be graduate students.

2. Graduate student members are elected annually by the department's History Graduate Student Organization (HGSO).
3. Undergraduate representatives are recommended by the Undergraduate Committee and appointed by the Chairperson.

F. Quorum

A quorum must be present at a departmental meeting in order for any vote to be held. Presentations and discussions may take place in the absence of a quorum. A quorum will be determined by the following procedure:

1. At the start of each semester, the quorum number will be calculated by counting the number of faculty holding tenure-track or continuing multi-year appointments, dividing this number by three and rounding up to the nearest whole number.
2. A quorum is constituted when the number of faculty holding tenure-track or continuing appointments present at a departmental meeting meets or exceeds the quorum number.
3. The presence of student representative at a meeting does not contribute to the determination of a quorum.

G. Matters for Consideration at Departmental Meetings

With the exception of bylaws revisions and general announcements, all agenda items must be distributed electronically to the members of the department before noon two business days preceding the meeting at which they will be discussed or acted upon. This rule may be waived by the majority consent of voting members present at the meeting.

H. Email and Paper Ballots

The Department Chair may call for a vote via email ballot for time-sensitive business that arises between regularly scheduled departmental meetings. Voting rights for email ballots are the same as voting rights for departmental meetings. For an email vote to be valid, the total number of votes cast by faculty must be greater than or equal to the number needed to constitute a quorum at a regular departmental meeting. Email ballots will be distributed and collected by the department's administrative associate, who will convey the outcome to the Department Chair while protecting the confidentiality of the votes. The Chair will announce these results to the department. Under some circumstances (such as election of members of the Faculty Executive Board), the Chair may use paper ballots for holding departmental votes outside regular meetings. Unless otherwise stipulated by departmental bylaws, the rules governing paper ballots will be the same as email ballots.

I. Virtual Attendance and Voting

The right to vote has special importance at departmental meetings called to discuss major issues, such as promotion and tenure recommendations, the appointment of faculty or the Department Chair, and bylaw revisions. If a department member with voting rights on a major issue is unable to attend in person in the course of their professional duties, such as attending an out-of-town conference or research leave, provision can be made to attend and vote at a departmental meeting in a virtual manner using the following procedure:

1. The absentee shall provide a written statement to the presiding chair that appoints a proxy in attendance at the departmental meeting.
2. The absentee shall be admitted to virtual attendance based on the majority vote of those in attendance.
3. It is the proxy's responsibility to arrange and handle the interface for the absentee's virtual attendance, which should enable the absentee to hear discussion and to communicate questions, comments, and their vote.
4. When voting, the proxy should fill out a ballot on behalf of the absentee with the direct assistance of the presiding chair, who will then include the ballot in tabulations of the departmental vote, while otherwise protecting its confidentiality.
5. As an alternative, faculty members unable to attend a meeting in person may submit a concise signed opinion to the presiding chair to be shared during general faculty discussion.

III. Chairperson

A. Duties

The Department Chairperson is the administrative and operating head of the department, the chair of departmental meetings, and an ex officio member of all departmental committees. The Chair is also the representative of the department with other units, departments, divisions, and administrators of the university, except in those cases when another member of the department has been specifically designated to act in that capacity. The Chair's main duties include:

1. Providing oversight and leadership for all unit activities.
2. Administering the undergraduate and graduate academic programs of the unit, including the appointment in consultation with the Faculty Executive Board of a Director of Undergraduate Studies, Director of Graduate Studies, and committees to oversee these activities.
3. Reviewing and revising long-range plans for the unit, in consultation with the unit's Governance Committee.
4. Overseeing all internal budgetary, administrative, space, and personnel matters.

5. Supervising and reviewing the unit's faculty and professional, academic, and support staff.
 6. Seeking to enhance resources available to the unit by actively seeking internal and external funding, in consultation with the unit's Development Committee.
 7. Developing and enhancing research and educational relationships between the unit and other units across the College and University, as well as with agencies outside the University, public and private.
 8. Cultivating future leadership for the department by mentoring faculty members and providing leadership opportunities.
 9. Executing College and University policy within the unit effectively.
 10. Representing and reporting for the unit to the College and other University entities.
 11. Serving as the main administrator, PI, or co-PI for grants originated by the department. (The PI would typically be a faculty member whose area of expertise lies in the area of the grant.)
 12. Appointing other departmental officers, faculty representatives, and employees to perform designated tasks.
 13. Maintaining, in consultation with the Governance Committee, accurate, up-to-date versions of departmental bylaws and policies that are posted on the departmental website.
 14. Hearing recommendations and complaints about faculty, staff, or students. When appropriate, the Chair will communicate these to University administration, or when relevant to Annual Faculty Evaluation or committee service, to the Faculty Executive Board.
- B. The Chairperson, when acting in that capacity, routinely speaks and acts on behalf of the department as a whole. Consequently, it is vital for the Chairperson to ascertain the will of the department by consultation and to act on that will. It is recognized that this consultation may take many forms and that this requirement in no way inhibits the right of the Chairperson to speak and act as an individual.
- C. The Governance Committee is designated to serve the Chair in a general advisory capacity, while the Faculty Executive Board may advise the Dean on the Chair's performance when appropriate.
- D. The term of office of the Chairperson shall be three to five years. Term length is to be determined by agreement between the incoming chairperson and the Dean of the College, and whatever agreement is reached will be promptly communicated to the department.

Extension of the term of office of the Chairperson for more than one year beyond the original term requires consultation with faculty at a departmental meeting.

E. Procedures for Selection and Appointment of a Chairperson

The selection of the Department Chair should reference current College policy on the matter: see <http://policy.ku.edu/CLAS/procedures-for-selection-of-chairs>. For the purpose of voting, the selection of a Chair is considered a personnel matter. In the case of an external search, the department will also follow bylaws for faculty appointments. In either case, the following procedure is required:

1. The Dean meets with voting members of the unit to review procedures and charge them to initiate the search.
2. Voting members of the department appoint a search committee and name a chair for it. The search committee chair must be a tenured member of the department.
3. The search committee prepares a position description and presents it to voting members for discussion and approval and then to the College Dean's Office for final approval.
4. In conjunction with the Dean's Office and SSC, the position announcement is uploaded to the University's hiring system and published more broadly if it involves an external search.
5. A call for applications and nominations is emailed to the unit and affiliated faculty.
6. The search committee reviews applicants and conducts interviews with the most promising candidates. Traditionally, interviews have been conducted with the committee of the whole.
7. The search committee presents its recommendations to the unit, and the unit's voting members identify candidate strengths and weaknesses and vote for their preferred candidate in a manner that will preserve the confidentiality of their votes. Student representatives are encouraged to participate in the initial discussion that follows the search committee's recommendation, but are not allowed to vote and should vacate the room during general discussion by faculty entitled to vote on personnel matters. Faculty members must attend the meeting in person or via the procedure for virtual attendance to be eligible to vote.
8. Voting procedure: After the search committee chair closes discussion, each member entitled to vote on personnel decisions will receive a series of ballots with all finalist names.
 - a. Each voting member will vote for their ONE favored candidate and designate any candidate they consider "unacceptable."

- b. The candidate receiving the majority of votes will be designated the top-ranked candidate.
 - c. Any candidate deemed unacceptable by the majority of voters at any point will be designated unacceptable by the department.
 - d. If no candidate receives a majority on the ballot, the lowest vote recipient will be eliminated from consideration on the subsequent ballot. Voting will continue until a majority agrees on a top-ranked candidate.
 - e. This procedure will be repeated for ranking the remaining finalists until all finalists are ranked.
 - f. In the case of a persistent tie, the search committee chair will communicate a tied ranking to the Dean.
9. The ranking that results from this vote and the list of strengths and weaknesses produced by the search committee (modified as appropriate after meeting discussion) will provide the principal basis for the department's recommendation for appointment to the Dean and other University administration. After ranking is completed, the search committee chair will inform official student representatives of this outcome, so that they can inform other interested students, taking care to protect the confidentiality of the outcome and process.

IV. Department Officers

- A. Associate Chairperson: The Associate Chair is appointed and supervised by the Chairperson and has the following duties:
1. Determining the department's schedule of courses, including which courses are offered and the dates and times of instruction. In setting the course schedule, the Associate Chair sends out a call each fall semester for faculty to recommend courses for the subsequent academic year and consults with the Graduate and Undergraduate Directors and relevant groups of faculty with shared teaching interests.
 2. Overseeing and evaluating the performance of limited-term and multi-year lecturers, visiting professors, and similar appointments, when appropriate.
 3. Taking the place of the Chairperson when they are unavailable or otherwise unable to perform the duties of the Chair, both for internal matters and when representing the department to outside units.
 4. Monitoring student credit hour production and the number of undergraduate majors and minors and pursuing strategies to maintain or grow these numbers.
 5. Other responsibilities as the directed by the Chairperson.
- B. Director of Graduate Studies

The Director of Graduate Studies is appointed and supervised by the Chairperson. The main duty of the Director of Graduate Studies is to preside over the department's graduate program and the Graduate Committee. If the Chair and Associate Chair are unable to perform the duties of Chairperson, the Director of Graduate Studies will substitute.

Other important duties of the Director include, but are not restricted to:

1. Ensuring that departmental protocols and policies for graduate students conform to College and University standards.
2. Representing the graduate program to the College and University.
3. Ministering to the questions and concerns of present, past, and prospective graduate students and of faculty regarding the graduate program.
4. Serving as liaison between graduate students and faculty.
5. Assisting faculty in guiding their students through the program.
6. Coordinating the annual admissions process and guiding applicants through the process.
7. In collaboration with the History Graduate Student Organization, planning and executing the annual Prospective Students Visit for newly admitted students.
8. Overseeing the granting of departmental awards for graduate students.
9. Preparing applications for graduate student funding and awards internal to the College and University.
10. Planning and executing professional development activities for graduate students.
11. Assigning GTAs to History courses each semester, in consultation with graduate students and instructors of record regarding preference.
12. Recommending to the Associate Chair advanced graduate students to teach their own History course(s) as Assistant Instructors.
13. Serving as liaison between GTAs and instructors of record regarding performance and related concerns.
14. Collecting, preparing, and submitting data on the graduate program for the College and University.

C. Director of Undergraduate Studies

The Director of Undergraduate Studies is appointed and supervised by the Chairperson. The main duty of the Director of Undergraduate Studies is to preside over the department's undergraduate program and Undergraduate Committee.

Other important duties of the Director include, but are not restricted to:

1. Ensuring that departmental protocols and policies for undergraduate students conform to College and University standards.
2. Representing the undergraduate program to the College and University.
3. Ministering to the questions and concerns of present, past, and prospective undergraduate students and of faculty regarding the undergraduate program.
4. Serving as liaison between undergraduate students and faculty.

5. Coordinating undergraduate course offerings within the department, with other units offering “meets with” courses or cross-listed courses.
6. Coordinating undergraduate advising with the department’s advising specialist, and where appropriate, with faculty and other student advisors in the College and University.
7. Collecting, preparing, and submitting KU Core assessments and degree-level assessments each year.
8. Overseeing the granting of departmental awards for undergraduate students.
9. Preparing applications for undergraduate student funding and awards internal to the College and University.
10. Overseeing cases of academic misconduct by undergraduates.
11. Implementing strategies for the recruitment of majors and minors.
12. Implementing strategies for promoting undergraduate enrollment in history courses.
13. Collecting, preparing, and submitting data on the undergraduate program for the College and University.
14. Around the twentieth class-day of each semester, soliciting and archiving syllabi for all courses being taught that semester.

D. Department officers are normally given ten-month appointments. The Chairperson will request supplemental summer salary for these positions from the College, and with approval of the Dean, will provide a one-course reduction in teaching responsibilities each year. Upon conclusion of a three-year term in the position, the Chairperson will recommend to the Dean a one-semester Special Research Assignment.

E. Strategic Planning

As our official leaders, the Chairperson and Department Officers are primarily responsible for strategic planning for the department and will do so in close consultation with other departmental committees and department members as a whole. Strategic planning involves envisioning desired futures for the department and formulating concrete goals that can be translated into operational plans and actions. It also involves accounting for the financial resources available for achieving these goals and planning for contingencies. Every three to five years, or at moments when requested by the Dean or University administration, such as before and after an External Review, the Chair and Department Officers will draw up a long-term Strategic Plan for the department, which they will submit to the department for discussion and approval. Each academic year, the Chair and Department Officers will make an annual assessment of the Strategic Plan’s progress, deficiencies, and intervening contingencies; discuss this assessment at a departmental meeting; and make appropriate alterations and amendments to the Strategic Plan. Whenever possible, this will be done in parallel with the discussion of priorities in hiring, following the procedure outlined under Faculty Appointments.

V. Faculty Appointments

A. Permanent Additions to Regular Faculty

Procedures for additions to the regular faculty and teaching professors will be governed by the Handbook for Faculty and Unclassified Staff and Guidelines on Academic Appointments of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, available at <http://policy.ku.edu/CLAS/academic-appointments>. No one may become a permanent member of the department without the support of the majority vote of the members of the department present or virtually present at a regular or special meeting. Student representatives and emeriti faculty may not vote on faculty appointments.

B. Differential Allocation of Effort (DAE):

Differential Allocations of Effort are governed by the Provost's policy, available at: <http://policy.ku.edu/provost/DAE>. The Department of History normally expects tenured and tenure-track faculty to devote 40 percent of their effort to research, 40 percent to teaching, and 20 percent to service to the university, community, and profession, and it typically applies these weights when evaluating faculty performance. Teaching professors are normally expected to devote 10 percent to research, 75 percent to teaching, and 10 percent to service, with the additional 5 percent of effort allocated by contract to one of those three categories.

Changes in the standard allocation of effort or an existing DAE can be initiated by the faculty member or Department Chair. Reasons for Differential Allocation of Effort can include short-term alterations, such as research-intensive semesters or funded research, or longer-term alterations related to career stage, performance, editorial or administrative appointments, or other issues. Departmental needs take precedence over individual needs when making decisions to alter a faculty member's Allocation of Effort, and redistribution must be consistent with the best interests of the unit.

If a faculty member would like to make a DAE agreement, whether temporary or permanent, they should make this request to the Department Chair, who will consult with the appropriate Dean about the feasibility of the request. Any changes to faculty Allocation of Effort will be documented in the faculty member's personnel file and made available to the Faculty Executive Board for the purpose of annual evaluation. If the faculty member and Chairperson disagree about the DAE, the faculty member may request a non-binding review by an ad-hoc faculty committee designated to hear such matters. Long-term DAEs must be reviewed at least every three years.

C. Authorization for New Positions

1. Each year as requested by the Dean, voting members of the department will suggest and discuss potential hires and produce, by vote, a ranked list of priorities in hiring. The Chairperson will initiate this process and convey this list to the Dean with appropriate explanations for those hires and their ranking.

2. Discussion and voting procedure: In advance of the departmental meeting at which potential hires will be discussed, the ranked list of suggestions for future hires from the previous year will be distributed to members of the department. Each voting member of the department (including student representatives) is requested to submit a ranked list of up to five suggestions for future hires and turn in this preliminary ranking to the department's administrative associate for tabulation. In consultation with Department Officers, the Department Chair will group suggestions that are very similar for the purpose of tabulating this preliminary list and to solicit further suggestions inspired by departmental teaching needs. The resulting non-binding tabulation will be circulated to the department and provide a starting point for discussion. From the list of possible positions discussed at the meeting, each voter should list on a ballot as many positions as desired; rank these selections numerically from highest preference to lowest preference; and turn in this ranking for tabulation to the department's administrative associate who will maintain their confidentiality. Voters may also write in positions that were not discussed.

For both the preliminary and final votes, one point will be allocated for each first-place vote; 1/2 point for each second-place vote; 1/3 point for each third-place vote; 1/4 point for each fourth-place vote; and so forth. The final list of positions submitted to the Dean will be ranked based on the number of points received from the total vote, and the final ranked list and points will be reported to the department as a whole. Ties will be reported in alphabetical order as ties. Votes for positions that are very similar may be combined or disaggregated in the preliminary and final rankings at the discretion of the Chair.

3. Recommendations for potential direct hires, including domestic partner accommodations and Langston Hughes Professorships, should be directed to the Department Chairperson. The Chair will then consult with the Dean and the department about the feasibility of such a hire.

D. Search Procedures for Tenure-Track Faculty Positions

1. Once a position has been authorized, the Chairperson will appoint a search committee to conduct preliminary evaluations of candidates. The search committee will be composed of faculty from relevant fields, faculty from the department at large, a graduate student representative, a member external to the department, and the total should be an odd number to avoid tie votes. The graduate student and external representative vote as members of the committee, but do not vote on final departmental hiring decisions. The Department Chair will designate a chairperson for the search committee.
2. In consultation with the Department Chair and Dean's Office, the search committee will produce a draft position description and job advertisement and present them to the department for discussion and approval and to the Dean and University administration for final approval.

3. Search committee members and the Department Chair will carefully follow policies and procedures of the College, Provost, Human Resources, and Equal Opportunity for faculty recruitment, with the overall goals of maximizing the diversity and quality of the applicant pool.
4. When the deadline for initial review arrives, the search committee will obtain a complete list of applicants and access to their complete applications. After evaluating all application files and consulting with University administration to ensure that other procedural requirements have been met, the search committee will compose a list of between nine and twelve candidates for screening interviews. The committee will make this interview list available to voting members of the department, who will be given access to all application materials so they can provide feedback to the committee on these choices.
5. Once the search committee has secured permission from the appropriate University offices to interview these candidates, the Department Chair will solicit a vote by eligible members of the department to approve the interview list. This vote may be conducted electronically.
6. After screening interviews and thoughtful deliberation, the search committee will typically select three candidates to invite to campus, and will provide at least two names as ranked alternates. The search committee chair will secure permission from the appropriate University offices to invite those candidates to campus. At this point, the search committee chair will inform all candidates that invitations for on-campus interviews have been made.
7. After all candidates have visited campus, the search committee will compose a report summarizing the strengths and weaknesses of the finalists. The graduate student representative on the search committee will survey graduate students about their response to the candidates and submit this summary to include in the committee report. If the search committee can reach a consensus on ranking the finalists, it may include a suggested ranking in its report, or it can leave the finalists unranked. This report will be made available to faculty eligible for voting on hiring in advance of the meeting to discuss candidates, unless the department agrees by majority vote to waive the two-business-day rule. To help ensure confidentiality, this report will be made available in paper form and kept in the administrative associate's office.
8. The Department Chair will call a departmental meeting to discuss the candidates and recommend appointments to the College. The meeting will begin with the search committee chair's summary of the committee report. Student and external representatives are encouraged to participate in the initial discussion that follows the search committee's report, but are not allowed to vote and should vacate the room during general discussion by faculty entitled to vote on personnel matters.
9. Voting procedure: If there are more than two finalist candidates, voting will proceed similarly to the procedure for electing a Department Chair. After the Department

- Chair closes discussion, each member entitled to vote on personnel decisions will receive a series of ballots with all finalist names. Faculty members must attend the meeting in person or via the procedure for virtual attendance to be eligible to vote.
- a. Each voting member will vote for their ONE favored candidate and designate any candidate they consider “unacceptable.”
 - b. The candidate receiving the majority of votes will be designated the top-ranked candidate.
 - c. Any candidate deemed unacceptable by the majority of voters at any point will be designated unacceptable by the department.
 - d. If no candidate receives a majority on the ballot, the lowest vote recipient will be eliminated from consideration on the subsequent ballot. Voting will continue until a majority agrees on a top-ranked candidate.
 - e. This procedure will be repeated for ranking the remaining finalists until all finalists are ranked.
 - f. In the case of a persistent tie, the search committee chair will rank the tied candidates (in this specific situation, giving the search committee chair a double vote).
10. The ranking that results from this vote and the list of strengths and weaknesses produced by the search committee (modified as appropriate after meeting discussion) will provide the principal basis for the department’s recommendation for appointment to the Dean and other University administration.
11. After ranking is completed, the search committee chair will inform the student search representative of this outcome, so that the representative can inform other interested students, taking care to protect the confidentiality of the outcome and process. Once University administration formally approves that an offer of appointment can be made to a candidate, the search committee chair will inform in a timely manner all candidates for the position that an official offer of appointment has been made. When an offer of appointment is formally accepted by a candidate and approved by the University, the Department Chair will inform members of the department and the search committee chair will inform all applicants of the conclusion of the search.

E. Teaching Professors and Other Direct Hires

1. Teaching professors are appointed to three-year, renewable positions. They are eligible for promotion after six years as described in an appendix. They are not eligible for tenure, but their appointments are envisioned as continuing provided that their performance meets or exceeds expectations and the budget permits. They have voting rights on a par with regular faculty, but may not vote on promotion and tenure cases for tenure-track faculty. Annual Evaluation of teaching professors follows procedures similar to those of tenure-track faculty as described in an appendix. They may be appointed through a competitive search, in which case the search procedure should follow that of tenure-track faculty.

2. The Department of History will make a concerted effort to recruit faculty from underrepresented groups by recommending direct hires and to retain faculty within our department and in other units via domestic partner accommodations. Procedures for domestic partner accommodations and other direct hires are governed by policies of the College and Provost. See, for example, <http://policy.ku.edu/CLAS/domestic-partner-accommodation> and <http://diversity.ku.edu/langston-hughes-visiting-professors>.
3. The direct appointment of teaching professors, ~~domestic partner accommodations~~, and any other tenure-track faculty hires is governed by the following procedure, if it does not involve a competitive search:
 - a. Once the Dean authorizes consideration of a prospective hire to move forward, the Chairperson or designated faculty will present their credentials to the department for consideration. If a majority of a quorum of those with the right to vote on personnel matters approves, consideration of this new hire will move on to a formal interview. Such a vote can be done electronically or in a departmental meeting.
 - b. At a minimum, a formal interview will involve sharing a portfolio demonstrating the candidate's accomplishments and potential in research, teaching, and service and a public presentation to the department demonstrating one or more of these capabilities.
 - c. After completion of the interview process, the Department Chair will present a report summarizing the candidate's strengths and weaknesses to a meeting of the department. After discussion, eligible faculty will vote to approve or disapprove of the candidate's hire. This report and vote will provide the basis for the department's recommendation for appointment to the Dean and other University administration.

VI. Other Appointments

A. Professors Emeriti

Retired colleagues who have been relieved of departmental obligations and advanced to the rank of Professor Emeritus have not relinquished many of the rights and privileges that accompany membership in the department. The department will work to ensure that they will continue to enjoy such benefits as they care to utilize. These include, but are not limited to, a departmental mailbox, mailing privileges, use of departmental stationery and other office supplies, and secretarial assistance. They are eligible for office space as departmental availability permits, and may continue to advise students and offer such courses as University rules and departmental needs allow. Their participation in departmental meetings and other departmental activities will be welcomed, albeit without a voting role. All of this entails no obligation on their part, but merely represents the department's desire to recognize that retirement should not diminish the fellowship they enjoy, in the conviction that Professor Emeritus is a highly esteemed academic rank which deserves respect and consideration.

B. Research Associates and Adjunct Faculty

The Department Chair may appoint qualified individuals as unpaid research associates or adjunct faculty, as permitted by University rules.

C. Courtesy Faculty Appointments

1. Faculty members who do not hold appointments in the Department of History but whose research and/or teaching is historical in nature may be appointed as courtesy members of the department.
2. The chairperson may make courtesy appointments based on the recommendation of departmental faculty or when approached directly by a prospective appointee. Such appointments are subject to approval by University administration.
3. Courtesy faculty are encouraged to participate in departmental programs, but do not hold voting rights within the department.

D. Non-Tenure-Track Appointments

Appointment of lecturers, visiting professors, assistant instructors, and other paid non-tenure-track appointments (with the exception of teaching professors) will be made by the Chairperson, who will do so in consultation with Department Officers and Subject Area Caucuses, especially in the case of full-time and multi-year appointments. The Associate Chair is primarily responsible for supervising these appointments.

E. Classified and Support Staff

The Department Chair is responsible for the hiring, assignment of duties, supervision, and evaluation of all support staff assigned to the department.

VII. Appointments to Regular Department Committees

- A. Each faculty member with FTE in the department will serve on one and only one of the following five Regular Committees during an academic year: Undergraduate, Graduate, Governance, Development, and the Faculty Executive Board (FEB). The existence of these committees will not preclude the formation of ad hoc committees by the Chair or other departmental members to meet special needs.
- B. At the end of the academic year (or as circumstances require), the FEB will make recommendations to the Department Chair regarding the appointment of faculty to Regular Committees to ensure that all committees have a balanced membership appropriate to their responsibilities and in the best interests of the department. Faculty committee assignments, whenever possible, should be no less than two years and no more than four (excluding *ex officio* service).

- C. Joint appointments: Faculty with 0.5 or less FTE in the department will be appointed to a Regular Committee, but with the exception of the FEB, they will be expected to provide less service, such as serving for only one semester during a calendar year, given their obligations to other departments. The details of their service will be negotiated among the faculty member, the committee chair, and the Department Chair.

VIII. Student Representation on Committees

- A. Students are entitled to be represented on all policy-making and search committees within the department at less than or equal to 20 percent of the faculty representation, and they are considered full voting members of departmental committees, unless specifically delimited by departmental bylaws. For example, student representatives are not involved in matters relating to faculty or student evaluation, and thus do not serve on the Faculty Executive Board. Students may serve in a representative capacity on a committee with fewer than four faculty members, but do so in an advisory capacity without a vote.
- B. A graduate student shall be represented on the Graduate Committee. An undergraduate shall be represented on the Undergraduate Committee. Either graduate or undergraduate students may serve on the Governance, Outreach, and other departmental committees. Students will not be represented on the Faculty Executive Board and shall not take part in any discussion or voting on personnel matters, including evaluation of sabbatical applications, misconduct deliberations, requests for travel/research funding, promotion and tenure committees, graduate admissions, or any matters that the Committee chair deems of a confidential nature. Student participation in changes to requirements in the undergraduate or graduate curriculum will be of an advisory nature, and without a vote in the matter. The participation of student representatives in faculty searches is discussed in the section on Faculty Appointments.
- C. Selection: At the start of each academic year, the Director of Graduate Studies will initiate the process of selecting student representatives by distributing a call for nominations to all eligible students that includes this section of the bylaws. Faculty, student leaders, and interested students themselves are encouraged to nominate prospective representatives. The History Graduate Student Organization (HGSO) will annually select the graduate student representatives to the permanent committees and fill any vacancies that may occur. The Department Chair will select the undergraduate representatives to the standing committees, in consultation with the Undergraduate Director.
- D. Expectations: Student representatives provide a vital service to the department. They are expected to attend all meetings of the committees to which they are assigned and to help fulfill the duties of these committees as described in their respective sections of departmental bylaws. It is important for student representatives to consult regularly with one another and with other students generally so that they can be effective

representatives of the diversity of student interests and perspectives where departmental policies and activities are concerned. Student representatives will sometimes be involved in discussions of a confidential nature. It is important for students to protect this confidentiality and to ask faculty for advice on how to do so, as needed.

IX. Undergraduate Committee

- A. The chair will be appointed by the Department Chair and be designated as Director of Undergraduate Studies. The Director oversees the completion of the Undergraduate Committee's tasks, delegates responsibilities to members of the Committee, and makes reports to the Department Chair and department as a whole.
- B. Duties of the Undergraduate Committee:
1. **Curricula:** Provide feedback on proposals for undergraduate courses. Review existing curricula and, as needed, suggest curricular changes to the department as a whole.
 2. **Academic Misconduct:** Administer misconduct cases that arise in undergraduate classes.
 3. **Scheduling:** Consult with the Associate Chair concerning the appropriate number, variety, and timing of undergraduate courses.
 4. **Recruitment:** Monitor student credit hours and actively promotes the major and minor programs to students, and promote diversity and gender balance to enhance the undergraduate program. Promote retention of undergraduate majors and minors.
 5. **Advising:** Maintain a system of advising for majors/minors and prospective majors/minors, in consultation with College and University undergraduate advising services.
 6. **Phi Alpha Theta:** Select students for Phi Alpha Theta and plan the annual induction ceremony as well as other events for the organization.
 7. **Honors Program:** Consult with the Associate Chair concerning staffing of the two-semester honors thesis sequence of courses (HIST 690 and 691) and other honors courses. Coordinates activities for the department's honors students.
 8. **Awards and Scholarships:** Present a call for nominations and applications for available undergraduate scholarships and awards and make recommendations to the Chair for the disbursement of such scholarships and awards to eligible students.
 9. **Undergraduate Research:** Promote the research activities of undergraduate students, including advising the Chair on the expenditure of departmental funds to assist

students in their research and to encourage faculty-undergraduate research collaboration.

10. Public/Social Events: Plan other events and programs directed towards undergraduate students.
 11. Study abroad: Evaluate study abroad courses for History credit. Assist the Office of Study Abroad in managing these aspects of the undergraduate major and minor.
 12. Transfer course credit: In consultation with College and University student advisors, determine the appropriate awarding of credit for courses students have taken at other institutions.
 13. All other duties and responsibilities for maintaining the integrity and proper functioning of the undergraduate program that are not specified above.
- C. Student representation: Student representatives have an advisory but not a voting role in the determination of curricular requirements.

X. Graduate Committee

- A. The chair will be appointed by the Department Chair and be designated as Director of Graduate Studies. The Director oversees the completion of the Graduate Committee's tasks, delegates responsibilities to members of the Committee, and makes reports to the Department Chair and department as a whole.
- B. Duties of the Graduate Committee:
1. Curricula: Provide feedback on proposals for graduate courses. Reviews existing curricula and, as needed, suggest curricular changes to the department as a whole.
 2. Academic Misconduct: Administer misconduct cases that arise in graduate classes.
 3. Scheduling: Solicit proposals from faculty members to teach graduate courses each year, and in consultation with the Associate Chair, schedule a slate of courses appropriate to graduate student number, interests, and availability.
 4. Admissions: In consultation with students' prospective advisors, review applicant files and rank students for admission to the MA and PhD programs. Nominate prospective students for fellowships and other awards internal to the College and University. Match matriculating students with advisors.
 5. GTAships: In consultation with the Department Chair, award graduate teaching assistantships to graduate students.

6. Recruitment: Actively promote the department's graduate program to prospective graduate students, including assisting with the annual Prospective Students Visit for newly admitted students. Promote diversity and a gender balance to enhance the graduate program.
 7. Advising: Maintain a system for evaluating student progress to ensure timely completion of degree; help the Graduate Administrative Associate track student progress through degree milestones; and intervene when students are not making expected progress. Assist the Director of Graduate Studies to ensure graduate students have compatible advisors and advisory committees and to resolve difficulties between graduate students and faculty members.
 8. Awards and Scholarships: Solicit nominations and applications for available fellowships, scholarships, prizes, and awards and makes recommendations and nominations to the Chair, College, and University for eligible graduate students.
 9. Graduate Research: Promote the research activities of graduate students, including advising the Chair on the expenditure of departmental funds to assist students in their research, and to encourage faculty-graduate student research collaboration.
 10. Public/Social Events: Coordinate with the History Graduate Student Organization in designing and promoting events directed towards History graduate students.
 11. Graduate Handbook: Maintain and update the Graduate Handbook. All substantive changes to the History Graduate Handbook must be approved by the department.
 12. All other duties and responsibilities for maintaining the integrity and proper functioning of the graduate program that are not specified above.
- C. Student representation: Student representatives have an advisory but not a voting role in the determination of curricular requirements. Student representatives do not participate in graduate admissions or deliberations on the granting of travel/research funding requests.

XI. Governance Committee

- A. The chair will be appointed by the Department Chair from among faculty assigned to this committee. The chair oversees completion of Governance Committee tasks, delegates responsibilities to members of the Committee, and makes reports to the Department Chair and department as a whole.
- B. Duties of the Governance Committee:
 1. Advisory: The most important duty is to advise the Department Chair and other members of the department on general policy and procedures within the department, both official and customary.

2. **Bylaws:** Maintain bylaws that authorize and regularize important departmental policies and procedures and that are consistent with College and University policies. All proposed changes must be approved by the process stipulated in the section below on Amendments to Bylaws.
3. **Policy Changes:** Monitor changes in policy of the College, Provost, Faculty Senate, University Senate, and Kansas Board of Regents. Report to the department on significant developments and institute changes to department bylaws and customary procedure as necessary.
4. **Departmental Meetings:** Provide a secretary for each regular and special departmental meeting to take minutes. The secretary has the responsibility to convey them in a timely manner to the Department Chair and administrative associate, including a complete and accurate text of all formally adopted provisions.
5. **Evaluation of Sabbatical Applications:**
 - a. Members of the Governance Committee who are applying for sabbatical leave are ineligible to evaluate applications. If fewer than three members remain to perform this task, the Department Chair will appoint additional temporary members for this purpose. Student representatives do not participate in these evaluations.
 - b. At a time stipulated by the Governance Committee, typically three weeks before the College deadline for submission, faculty applying for sabbatical will provide a complete copy of their application to the Governance Committee for review.
 - c. Three Governance Committee members will review these applications, provide a concise formal assessment to the applicant and the Department Chair, and informally suggest improvements to each applicant.
 - d. The Committee will rank these applications, as required by the College, and this ranking will be forwarded along with the final applications.
 - e. At a time stipulated by the Governance Committee, typically one week before the College deadline for submission, applicants may submit a revised application to the Department Chair for endorsement, otherwise the initial submission will be forwarded to the College.
6. **Progress Toward Tenure Review (PTTR):**
 - a. Untenured members of the Governance Committee are ineligible to participate. If fewer than three members remain to perform this task, the Department Chair will appoint additional temporary members for this purpose. Student representatives do not participate in these evaluations.
 - b. At a time stipulated by the Department Chair and University administration, three Governance Committee members will evaluate a dossier on research, teaching, and service for each faculty member required to undergo Progress

Toward Tenure Review, following procedures described in the appendix on PTTR.

7. Other Reports: The Governance Committee may also be charged by the Department Chair with composing other reports and self-studies, for example, in association with External Review.
 8. Grievances: Handle formal grievance proceedings and make recommendations to the Department Chair regarding their outcome (see appendix).
 9. All other duties and responsibilities for maintaining the integrity and proper functioning of departmental governance and procedure not specified above.
- C. Student representation: Student representatives do not participate in evaluation of sabbatical applications or Progress Toward Tenure Review.

XII. Outreach Committee

- A. The chair will be appointed by the Department Chair from among faculty assigned to this committee. The chair oversees the completion of Outreach Committee tasks, delegates responsibilities to members of the Committee, and makes reports to the Department Chair and department as a whole.
- B. Duties of the Outreach Committee:
1. The overarching duties of the Outreach Committee are to improve the visibility of the department and its constituents, to foster intellectual community and communication among the department's membership, and to increase our access to resources. This requires conceiving innovative ways for the department to raise funds, to reach out to the world, and to encourage interaction among departmental members beyond those listed here.
 2. Website: Oversees maintenance and updating of the department's "front porch" and faculty website profiles, including supervising the work of the department's administrative associate, student employees, and contracted professionals.
 3. Publicity: Oversees the production and dissemination of other departmental publicity to members of the department, the University community, alumni, and the public. This may include but is not limited to bulletin boards, the office information screen, social media, email circulars, press releases, newsletters, fliers, published advertisements, and content for College and University information services.
 4. Promotion: Solicits news of accomplishments by department faculty, staff, graduate and undergraduate students, and alumni for inclusion, as appropriate, on the departmental website, in other publicity, and for reporting to the Dean and other University administration.

5. **Events:** Oversees the organization of regular and occasional events for the department, such as the annual convocation, graduation reception, departmental brownbags and seminars, invited speakers, and National History Day. Helps disseminate publicity of events involving members of the department or departmental sponsorship.
6. **Fundraising:** Develops strategies, implements plans, and organizes events for fundraising, including maintaining contact information for alumni and donors. Assists KU Endowment and the College with fundraising initiatives that will benefit the department.
7. **Library/Open Access Liaison:** A member of the Outreach Committee will serve as the department's liaison to KU Libraries and the Open Access repository and attend meetings on those matters.
8. **Collaborative grants:** Provides feedback on collaborative grant proposals involving members of the department.

XIII. Faculty Executive Board

A. Membership

The Faculty Executive Board (FEB) consists of three members selected from among regular faculty and teaching professors, who are elected by faculty vote for three-year terms. It must include faculty from at least two different ranks or classifications. The following are ineligible: Department Chair, Associate Chair, Graduate Director, and Undergraduate Director; faculty on leave during all or part of the subsequent academic year; individuals who have served a full term within the past three years; persons not evaluated by the FEB; and individuals with an active Improvement Plan. The individual with the most years served will coordinate the duties and meetings of the FEB as its chairperson. In the case where there is no one with clear seniority on the FEB, members will choose their own chair.

B. Election procedure

Board elections are staggered, so that each year one new member is added to the FEB. Before the end of spring semester each year, the Department Chair distributes a list of individuals eligible for election to the FEB to all members of the department eligible to vote on personnel matters. From this list, each voter should select up to five individuals for election; rank them from one (highest preference) to five (lowest preference); and turn in this ranking for tabulation to the department's administrative associate who will maintain their confidentiality. One point will be allocated for each first-place vote; 1/2 point for each second-place vote; 1/3 point for each third-place vote; 1/4 point for each fourth-place vote; and 1/5 point for each fifth-place vote. Subject to provisions requiring committee membership to include faculty from at least two different

ranks or classifications, the Chair will appoint the individual with the highest point total. Individuals with the second- and third-highest point totals will be the second and third alternates, and so forth for ranking additional alternates. In case of a tie, the Chair will choose between the tied candidates, while making an effort to keep the Board diverse. These election results will also be used to decide the membership of the Post-tenure Review Committee (see appendix).

C. Duties of the Faculty Executive Board:

1. Annual evaluations: The FEB administers Annual Faculty Evaluation and makes recommendations to the Chairperson on matters relevant to the annual evaluation, including Post-tenure Review and the allocation of merit salary increases, as stipulated in appendices.
2. Committee appointments: The FEB appoints individuals to departmental committees as stipulated in sections above.
3. Review and oversight of departmental operations: The FEB will review the policies and actions of the Department Chair, Department Officers, other departmental committees, and their respective chairs and members as described in the section below. When appropriate, the FEB also advises the Dean on the Department Chair's performance.

XIV. Subject Area Caucuses

Subject-area caucuses exist to advise the Chair and Department Officers on practical and strategic matters regarding staffing, course scheduling, curricular requirements, graduate reading lists, and other issues related to specific regional, thematic, and temporal areas of inquiry. There are two official caucuses: United States history and world history, and there can be any number of informal caucuses made up of two or more faculty with shared subject interests. Official caucuses should select their own faculty spokesperson and student representative each year. Faculty can be members of any number of caucuses, official or informal, in which they have a clear interest. Subject Area Caucuses are considered active if member faculty meet as a group at least once per year to discuss course scheduling, graduate student reading lists, or other matters.

XV. Review and Oversight of Department Officers, Committees, and Operations

- A. No committee, board, or officer of the department shall attempt to determine in any way the decisions that department members make about their subjects for future research. The intent here is to limit assessments and evaluation to the products of research effort.
- B. Any policy or practice promulgated by a departmental committee or its respective chair will be subject to formal review by the department when at least five voting members of the department submit a written statement to the chair of the Faculty Executive Board describing the need for such a review. The FEB chairperson will present and moderate discussion of the review at a departmental meeting. When appropriate, this review and

discussion will then be communicated to the Dean or other University administration for further action. When appropriate, the FEB also advises the Dean on the Department Chair's performance.

- C. Faculty who are dissatisfied with the FEB's actions and decisions regarding Annual Performance Evaluations should consult the department's Faculty Evaluation Plan (see appendix for procedures). Issues related to any other policy or practice promulgated by the Faculty Executive Board or its chair will be subject to formal review by the department when at least five voting members of the department submit a written statement describing the need for such a review to the Department Chair. The Department Chair will present and moderate discussion of the review at a departmental meeting. When appropriate, this review and discussion will then be communicated to the Dean or other University administration for further action.

XVI. Teaching, Advising, and Scheduling Responsibilities

- A. The normal teaching load of full-time faculty is four courses per year, with the exception of teaching professors and faculty with temporary or permanent Differential Allocations of Effort. Faculty members' teaching profiles should reflect an appropriate mix of courses at different levels that satisfy the department's teaching responsibilities in regard to its undergraduate major, graduate program, and the KU Core Curriculum.
- B. Per College policy, undergraduate courses normally must enroll at least 12 students and graduate courses at least 6 students, except as authorized by the Department Chair in order to satisfy the department's curricular needs.
- C. Team-Taught and Non-Departmental Courses: A faculty member may count participation in a team-taught course as the equivalent of serving as the sole instructor of a course if they normally attend all sessions of the course and participate fully in the planning of the course, selecting the textbooks, constructing the syllabus and schedule, preparing and grading all examinations, and assigning final grades; or if they are designated as the primary course coordinator with principal responsibility for all aspects of the course. When appropriate, assessment of load will be expressed in fractional terms (one-third, one-half, three-fourths, etc.) to reflect an estimate of each faculty member's participation. Normally, courses taught outside the department (without a History listing) will be taught as an overload. Exceptions will be made after consultation and agreement between individual faculty members and the Department Chair.
- D. Undergraduate Advising and Mentoring: The History Department faculty is collectively responsible for ensuring that our undergraduate students receive appropriate advising. To that end, each faculty member has the following responsibilities:

1. Cooperating with the staff academic advisor assigned by the College to the department in providing guidance to students in their fulfillment of major, minor, and Core requirements.
 2. Providing information about their courses so that students can make informed decisions when selecting them.
 3. Being available for consultation with students regularly in the department and/or electronically, preferably for three regularly scheduled hours each week that school is in session.
 4. Advising students on how to succeed in their academic work.
 5. Referring students encountering difficulties to the appropriate University offices.
 6. Helping students to prepare for post-graduation careers.
- F. Graduate Advising and Mentoring: Although a specific faculty member typically takes primary responsibility for advising a graduate student, the History Department faculty is collectively responsible for ensuring that our graduate students receive appropriate advice and mentoring. To that end,
1. Primary advisors of graduate students are responsible, in collaboration with the Graduate Director and the graduate program administrative associate, for tracking their advisees' progress, and for intervening when graduate students do not make expected progress.
 2. Members of graduate students' committees are responsible for providing responses to student questions and for reviewing students' written work in a timely manner.
 3. Faculty members should make themselves available for consultation with graduate students regularly in the department and/or electronically, preferably for three regularly scheduled hours each week that school is in session.
 4. Faculty members should refer graduate students encountering difficulties to the appropriate University offices.
 5. Faculty members have a responsibility for mentoring their graduate students in professional development and career preparation.
- G. Scheduling: The equitable distribution of teaching assignments is the responsibility of the Associate Chair, in consultation with the Department Chair, Directors of Graduate and Undergraduate Studies, and Subject Area Caucuses. Faculty in this section is understood to include teaching professors and lecturers with multi-year appointments. The following procedures should be utilized:
1. Early in fall semester, the Associate Chair, in consultation with the Undergraduate Director, will inform faculty of anticipated undergraduate teaching needs. The Associate Chair will solicit from faculty members their proposals of courses to teach in the fall and spring semesters of the following academic year, along with preferences for time, format, and size of enrollment. Faculty members are advised to consult with Subject Area Caucuses to which they belong and faculty who teach the same or related courses before submitting requests. As a part of this, faculty should also share tentative, long-term plans for rotating through courses in subsequent years.

2. Early in fall semester, the Graduate Director, in consultation with the Graduate Committee and Subject Area Caucuses, will solicit proposals from faculty to teach graduate classes for the following year. Such requests should include a justification for the course, including any students from outside the department who might be served by the course. When recommending a slate of graduate courses for scheduling to the Associate Chair, the Graduate Committee will consider the number of students likely to enroll and the equitable distribution of those courses across subject areas.
3. In consultation with the Undergraduate and Graduate Directors, the Associate Chair will review faculty preferences for teaching in light of the department's needs and assign courses accordingly. If a particular faculty member's preference cannot be sustained, the Associate Chair will endeavor to identify a substitute course that answers both to the department's needs and the faculty member's wishes. If faculty members have particular preferences concerning the format, size, days and times their courses are offered, they may express those preferences to the Associate Chair. However, the Associate Chair, acting for the Department Chair, has the final authority to assign teaching schedules.
4. If the Associate Chair, Graduate and/or Undergraduate Directors identify a teaching need that faculty are unable to fill or that might desirably be taught by an advanced graduate student as an Assistant Instructor to bolster their teaching credentials, they will consult with each other and the Department Chair concerning options for staffing those courses. If a limited-term lecturer is to be hired, the Department Chair will make the appointment.
5. When a current graduate student is assigned as the sole instructor for a course (i.e. Assistant Instructor), they must identify a teaching mentor from among the departmental faculty before the beginning of the semester. The teaching mentor will advise the Assistant Instructor concerning course design, syllabus preparation, assignments, and assessments throughout the semester. In addition, the teaching mentor will visit the class (in person or online), and is responsible for writing an evaluation of the Assistant Instructor's performance at the end of the semester.
6. Graduate Teaching Assistant (GTA) assignments: The Associate Chair will determine which courses should have GTAs assigned to them to assist instructors of record and inform the Graduate Director. The Graduate Director will then assign GTAs to these courses, taking into consideration the stated preference of graduate students and instructors of record when practical. GTAs and faculty members who prefer to be assigned together to particular courses may tell the Graduate Director, but the Graduate Director and the Associate Chair are empowered to make assignments in accord with the needs of the department.
7. If faculty or graduate students experience situational changes, such as fellowship leave or course reductions, that require changes in their future teaching schedule, they should inform the Associate Chair and Graduate Director immediately.

8. The Associate Chair will track advance enrollments in courses. When advance enrollments indicate that a course is unlikely to fill to the College minimum, the Associate Chair is empowered to cancel the course and reassign the faculty member to other instructional responsibilities. The Associate Chair will consult with the faculty members affected, but the Associate Chair, acting for the Department Chair, has the final say on teaching assignments. The Associate Chair may also reassign GTAs, Assistant Instructors, and limited-term lecturers based on course enrollments.
9. Summer Term and Winter Intercession Courses: Faculty members or advanced graduate students who would like to teach Summer Term or Winter Intercession courses should respond to the call for proposals for the next upcoming terms that is circulated by the Department Chair early in the fall semester. Proposals must demonstrate the likelihood that the course in question will meet minimum enrollment requirements. Courses that do not enroll sufficiently will be cancelled.
10. Study Abroad Courses: Faculty members may propose Study Abroad courses, but they are responsible for making all arrangements with the Office of Study Abroad and for supplying all information in a timely manner to the Department Chair necessary for making application to the College for funding.

XVII. Faculty Personnel Files

A. Departmental Personnel Files

The department recognizes the need to maintain a complete and accurate record of each faculty member's activities, while protecting the confidentiality of certain categories of information and limiting access to other categories of information. Therefore, the department's administrative associate maintains a file documenting each faculty member's professional activities. The Confidentiality of Personnel Records is governed by Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations (FSSR), Article VII, section 2, available at <https://policy.ku.edu/governance/FSSR#art7sect2>, and by the Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct, Article III, section 5, available at <https://policy.ku.edu/FacultyCodeKULawrence/faculty-code-of-rights#III>.

The following rules govern the use of materials in departmental personnel files:

1. Files concerning faculty members must be treated as confidential, and as such are available only to those administrators and committees who have direct responsibility for decisions concerning them. Within the History Department, the Department Chair, the Associate Chair, and the Faculty Executive Board may access materials in faculty files as necessary for fulfillment of their responsibilities. The department's administrative associates may access the files for the purpose of maintaining them.
2. Files connected with faculty member applications for Progress Towards Tenure Review, Promotion and Tenure, and Post-Tenure Review are kept separate from other

file materials. These files may be accessed only in connection with these processes by persons authorized to participate in these processes. Subsequent to the conclusion of these processes, these files may only be accessed by authorized persons in strict accordance with University rules and Kansas Open Records laws.

3. A faculty member may access their own personnel file upon request. A faculty member who wants to access their file will direct this request to the Department Chair. The Department Chair will remove from the file those items, such as letters of recommendation, that were provided to the department upon a pledge of confidentiality. The remainder of the file will be provided to the faculty member in a timely manner.
4. If, upon examination of their own file, a faculty member determines that information is incomplete or mistaken, they may notify the Department Chair, Dean, or other University administration of the inaccuracies and ask that the file be corrected.
5. Extraneous materials of an unofficial nature will not be retained in faculty members' individual files.

B. Faculty Members' Own Professional Files

According to the Faculty Code, Article III, section 6, faculty members have a right to keep their own offices and files, including computers and electronic files, secure from unlawful search and seizure. Faculty members also have the responsibility of compiling, preserving, and protecting the confidentiality of records they need to fulfill their professional responsibilities. This is particularly true of files relevant to student work, Progress Toward Tenure Review, Promotion and Tenure Review, Post-Tenure Review, and annual evaluations. Accordingly, faculty members should retain the following items:

1. A current curriculum vitae
2. Student grade records
3. Student evaluations of all courses taught
4. Annual evaluation reports and evaluation letters
5. Publications
6. Fellowships and grants awarded

The University of Kansas protects the privacy of its students' records in compliance with the federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and its implementing regulations. Therefore, faculty should take care to protect the privacy of students when maintaining these files. The department has secured bins for disposing of any paperwork that may be considered private, confidential, or sensitive. University Registrar policy covering the privacy of student records is available at: <http://policy.ku.edu/registrar/student-record-policy>.

XVIII. Student Academic Misconduct

Cases of academic misconduct by students in courses taught by the History Department will be handled according to the policies established by University Senate Rules and Regulations, Article II, section 6, available at: <http://policy.ku.edu/governance/USRR#art2sect6>.

Academic misconduct by a student shall include, but not be limited to, disruption of classes; threatening an instructor or fellow student in an academic setting; giving or receiving of unauthorized aid on examinations or in the preparation of notebooks, themes, reports or other assignments; knowingly misrepresenting the source of any academic work; unauthorized changing of grades; unauthorized use of University approvals or forging of signatures; falsification of research results; plagiarizing of another's work; violation of regulations or ethical codes for the treatment of human and animal subjects; or otherwise acting dishonestly in research.

Course instructors are required to report instances of academic misconduct. Therefore, faculty and other instructional staff should not handle suspected instances of academic misconduct in an informal manner, nor should they resolve them directly with the student.

When course instructors discover instances of suspected academic misconduct, they are required to act in a timely manner and should promptly compile the relevant documentation, including syllabus language relating to academic misconduct and its penalties, any course exercises to teach about plagiarism or other misconduct, assignment instructions, and all evidence of academic misconduct. If the student is an undergraduate, the course instructor will bring the evidence to the Undergraduate Director, who will initiate the process of charging the student with academic misconduct. If the student is a graduate student, the course instructor or academic advisor will bring the evidence to the Graduate Director, who will initiate the process of charging the student with academic misconduct. The course instructor may recommend a penalty, but resolution of this process will be handled by the Undergraduate or Graduate Committee.

XIX. Grade Appeals

- A. A student who objects to the final grade received in a History Department course, alleging improper application of course grading criteria and procedures should first seek redress directly with the course instructor. If the student is dissatisfied with the outcome at that point, they may file a grievance through the History Department's Grievance Policy. If the student is dissatisfied with the outcome at that point, they may appeal to the Judicial Board of the University, per University Senate Rules and Regulations 2.3.5 and 6.4.4.
- B. A student who objects to the final grade received in a History Department course alleging discrimination or other misconduct on the part of the instructor should file a complaint with the Office of Institutional Opportunity and Access, per University Senate Rules and Regulations 6.4.5.

XX. Amendments to the Bylaws

- A. Amendments to the bylaws must be adopted at a regular meeting of the department by majority vote. Amendments may be proposed by any member or standing committee of the department. Amendments must be distributed in writing at least one week before the meeting at which they are to be considered.

- B. At the request of two voting members present at any regular departmental meeting at which amendments are being considered, these amendments must be submitted to an email ballot in which all eligible voting members of the department will have the opportunity to vote.

Appendix A. Progress Toward Tenure Review Procedures

POLICY OWNER: DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

REVIEW, APPROVAL & CHANGE HISTORY:

Approved by vote of the faculty in the Department of History on April 17, 2019.

I. Purpose and Principles

The purpose of the Progress Toward Tenure Review (PTTR) is to provide faculty members with a meaningful appraisal of their cumulative progress to date toward earning tenure. A secondary purpose is to orient the tenure-track faculty member toward basic aspects of the tenure process. The review is conducted at the department and College levels.

The review assesses the faculty member's cumulative accomplishments and pattern of progress in research, teaching, and service at the University of Kansas. The reference point for this assessment is the History Department's and University's criteria for promotion and tenure and departmental and University goals for pre-tenure faculty. Neither the record of the review nor its results shall be included in a faculty member's promotion and tenure record and recommendations for or against promotion and tenure should not be influenced by favorable or unfavorable results of the Progress Toward Tenure Review. This limitation does not prevent consideration during the promotion and tenure review of the same documents and information considered by the Progress Toward Tenure Review.

Guidelines for "Pre-Tenure Matters" are covered by Article VI, Section 4 of Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations (FSSR), available at <https://policy.ku.edu/governance/FSRR#art6sect4>.

II. Period for Review

The Progress Toward Tenure Review is a formal review conducted approximately midway through the probationary period for tenure-track faculty. The review normally occurs during the third year of the tenure-track appointment. The start date of the tenure-track appointment is the base for calculating the timing of the progress toward tenure review. A faculty member's credited years of prior university service (as determined by the Provost Office at the time of initial appointment) are also counted when determining the Progress Toward Tenure Review date. For example, a faculty member with one year of credited prior service will be reviewed during the second year of their KU appointment. A faculty member will be exempt from the Progress Toward Tenure Review if they have received three or more years of prior service credit. Changes in the mandatory tenure review date under the policy for interruption of the tenure clock do not automatically affect the timing of the progress toward tenure review.

III. The PTTR Process

The major steps in the Progress Toward Tenure Review process within the department are as follows:

1. After receiving appropriate notification from the Dean and University administration, on a date decided by the Department Chair, each faculty member under review will submit to the Governance Committee a dossier on research, teaching, and service prepared according to current Progress Toward Tenure Review guidelines of the University.
2. Three tenured faculty on the Governance Committee will prepare a review on each dimension of this dossier and select one of the following overall outcomes:
 - a. Evidence supports continuing appointment at this time.
 - b. Evidence requires subsequent formal review during the next academic year.
 - c. Evidence supports a recommendation for notice of non-reappointment. (Procedures for notice of non-reappointment are governed by FSSR 6.4.3.)
3. The Department Chair will provide their own assessment of this dossier and the Governance Committee's review, and then forward the dossier, Governance Committee's review, and their own review to the College for assessment at that level.
4. After receiving feedback from the College, the Department Chair will schedule a conference with the faculty member to discuss the completed Progress Toward Tenure Review.

Appendix B. Promotion and Tenure Criteria and Procedures

POLICY OWNER: DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

REVIEW, APPROVAL & CHANGE HISTORY:

Approved by vote of the faculty in the Department of History on April 22, 2013.

Approved by vote of the faculty in the Department of History on April 17, 2019.

I. General Provisions

A. Scope and Purpose

The awarding of tenure and/or promotion in rank is among the most important and far-reaching decisions made by the Department of History because an excellent faculty is an essential component of any outstanding institution of higher learning. Promotion and tenure decisions also have a profound effect on the lives and careers of faculty. Recommendations concerning promotion and tenure must be made carefully, based upon a thorough examination of the candidate's record and the impartial application of these criteria and procedures, established in compliance with Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations (FSRR) Article VI.

It is the purpose of this document to promote the rigorous and fair evaluation of faculty performance during the promotion and tenure process by (a) establishing criteria that express the Department of History's expectations for meeting University standards in terms of disciplinary practices; (b) providing procedures for the initial evaluation of teaching, scholarship, and service; (c) preserving and enhancing the participatory rights of candidates, including the basic right to be informed about critical stages of the process and to have an opportunity to respond to negative evaluations; and (d) clarifying the responsibilities, roles, and relationships of the participants in the promotion and tenure review process.

Each level of review, including the initial department review, the intermediate College review, and the University level review, conducts an independent evaluation of a candidate's record of performance and makes independent recommendations to the Chancellor. Later stages of review neither affirm nor reverse earlier recommendations, which remain part of the record for consideration by the Chancellor. It is the responsibility of each person involved in the review process to exercise their own judgment to evaluate a faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and service based upon the entirety of the data and information in the record. No single source of information, such as peer review letters, shall be considered a conclusive indicator of quality.

B. Academic Freedom

All faculty members, regardless of rank, are entitled to academic freedom in relation to teaching and scholarship, and the right as citizens to speak on matters of public concern. Likewise, all faculty members, regardless of rank, bear the obligation to exercise their academic freedom responsibly and in accordance with the accepted standards of their academic disciplines.

C. Confidentiality and Conflicts of Interest

Consideration and evaluation of a faculty member's record is a confidential personnel matter. Only those persons eligible to vote on promotion and tenure may participate in or observe deliberations or have access to the files of materials pertaining to promotion and tenure cases in the department (except that department administrative associates may assist in the preparation of documents under conditions that assure confidentiality).

No person shall participate in any aspect of the promotion and tenure process concerning a candidate when participation would create a clear conflict of interest or compromise the impartiality of an evaluation or recommendation.

If a candidate believes that there is a conflict of interest, the candidate may petition the Department Chair or Dean to have that person recuse themselves. If a committee member does not recuse themselves, a decision about whether that person has a conflict of interest shall be made by a majority of the other committee members.

II. Promotion and Tenure Standards

A. General Principles

The University strives for a consistent standard of quality against which the performance of all faculty members is measured. Nonetheless, the nature of faculty activities varies across the University and a faculty member's record must be evaluated in light of their particular responsibilities and the expectations of the discipline. These criteria state the department's expectations of performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service necessary to satisfy the University standards for promotion for the award of tenure and/or promotion to associate professor and for promotion to full professor, or equivalent ranks.

Teaching and scholarship should normally be given primary consideration, but the particular weight to be accorded to each component of a faculty member's activities depends upon the responsibilities of the faculty member. The College has traditionally recognized the 40-40-20 formula for weighting research, teaching, and service for tenure-stream faculty members pursuant to their job description.

B. Teaching

Teaching is a primary function of the University, which strives to provide an outstanding education for its students. The evaluation of teaching includes consideration of syllabi, course materials, and other information related to a faculty member's courses; peer and student evaluations; a candidate's own statement of teaching philosophy and goals; public representations of teaching; and other accepted methods of evaluation.

High quality teaching is serious intellectual work grounded in a deep knowledge and understanding of the field and includes the ability to convey that understanding in clear and engaging ways.

The conduct of classes is the central feature of teaching responsibilities at KU, but teaching also includes supervising student research, mentoring and advising students, and other teaching-related activities outside of the classroom.

Under the University standards for the award of *tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor*, the record must demonstrate effective teaching, as reflected in such factors as command of the subject matter, the ability to communicate effectively in the classroom, a demonstrated commitment to student learning, and involvement in providing advice and support for students outside the classroom.

In the Department of History the following teaching expectations to meet University standards apply for the award of tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor:

1. Candidates should document effective teaching of two courses per semester, with exceptions for approved leaves or reduced teaching loads, for all levels at which they teach. The record must demonstrate that a candidate's teaching reflects knowledge of their field, and that the candidate is effective in encouraging students' interests, helping them to think critically and to apply their knowledge, pointing them toward broader implications of their study.
2. Candidates should provide written student evaluations according to the latest University regulations.
3. Candidates should make their teaching available for peer evaluation. This evaluation may be based on a combination of types of evidence: study of syllabi, examinations, and assignments; classroom observation; reports of guest lecturing and/or team teaching; consultation with the candidates; assessments of advising, new courses developed, teaching awards, and other evidence supplied by the candidates; and public representations of teaching. Evaluations of teaching may be authored by faculty and staff from outside the Department of History.
4. Candidates are expected to mentor undergraduate and graduate students.

Under the University standards for *promotion to the rank of professor*, the record must demonstrate continued effectiveness and growth as a teacher, as reflected in such factors as mastery of the subject matter, strong classroom teaching skills, an ongoing commitment to student learning, and active involvement in providing advice and support for students outside the classroom.

In the Department of History, the following teaching expectations to meet University standards apply for the promotion to the rank of professor:

1. Candidates should demonstrate continued effective teaching of two courses per semester, with exceptions for approved leaves or reduced teaching loads, for all levels at which they teach. The record must demonstrate that a candidate's teaching reflects knowledge

of their field, and that the candidate is effective in encouraging students' interests, helping them to think critically and to apply their knowledge, pointing them toward broader implications of their study.

2. Candidates must provide written student evaluations since promotion to associate professor, according to the latest University regulations.
3. Candidates should make their teaching available for peer evaluation since promotion to associate professor. This evaluation may be based upon a combination of evidence: review of new courses taught and/or developed; study of syllabi, examinations, assignments; classroom observations; reports of guest lecturing and/or team teaching; assessments of advising, teaching awards, consultations with the candidates, and other information provided by the candidates; and public representations of teaching. Evaluations of teaching may be authored by faculty and staff from outside the Department of History.
4. Candidates are expected to mentor undergraduate and graduate students.
5. Candidates have demonstrated growth as a teacher since their promotion to associate.

C. Scholarship

The concept of "scholarship" encompasses not only traditional academic research and publication, but also the creation of artistic works or performances and any other products or activities accepted by the academic discipline as reflecting scholarly effort and achievement for purposes of promotion and tenure. While the nature of scholarship varies among disciplines, the University adheres to a consistently high standard of quality in its scholarly activities to which all faculty members, regardless of discipline, are held. In the Department of History scholarship is defined as the publication of books, articles in refereed journals, and peer-reviewed or refereed chapters in books. Refereed critical editions, collected volumes, journal issues, compilations, translations, electronic publications, and public exhibits that are of equivalent scholarly significance to the above are also considered scholarship. Successful grant applications for scholarly research also demonstrate continued productivity.

Under the University standards for the award of *tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor*, the record must demonstrate a successfully developing scholarly career, as reflected in such factors as the quality and quantity of publications or creative activities, external reviews of the candidate's work by respected scholars or practitioners in the field, the candidate's regional, national, and/or international reputation, and other evidence of an active and productive scholarly agenda.

In the Department of History, the following scholarship expectations to meet University standards apply for the award of tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor:

1. Candidates should have in print or formally accepted and scheduled for publication either (a) a book-length peer-reviewed or refereed study with a respected press, or (b) at least

five substantial peer reviewed or refereed articles in respected journals, and/or substantial peer-reviewed or refereed chapters in books with a respected press, or (c) refereed critical editions, collected volumes, journal issues, compilations, translations, electronic publications, and public exhibits equivalent in scholarly significance to (a) or (b). Categories (b) and (c) may be mixed.

2. Candidates should provide information concerning the refereeing process for their scholarship.
3. Candidates should demonstrate a sustainable program of scholarly activity and successful development in their careers as scholars. A candidate's record must demonstrate clear evidence of a scholarly program that goes beyond research completed for the terminal degree, that has already resulted in products of high quality, and that exhibits promise of continuing productivity. Articles should appear in well regarded journals or collections; books should be published by presses well respected in their field or subfield.
4. Recommendation for promotion and tenure requires a positive assessment by the departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee of the overall quality and quantity of a faculty member's scholarship. The Committee will use its judgment in assessing the qualitative aspects of scholarship utilizing the solicited external reviews, unpublished peer reviews, and published reviews of published scholarship, if available.

Under the University standards for *promotion to the rank of professor*, scholarship that merits promotion to full professor is defined as continued scholarly production that represents sustained and significant contribution to the field well beyond that record prior to tenure.

In the Department of History, the following scholarship expectations to meet University standards also apply for the promotion to the rank of professor:

1. In addition to work published or formally accepted and scheduled for publication at the time of their promotion to associate professor, candidates should have in print or formally accepted and scheduled for publication either (a) a book-length peer-reviewed or refereed study with a respected press, or (b) at least five substantial peer-reviewed or refereed articles in respected journals, and/or substantial peer-reviewed or refereed chapters in books with a respected press, or (c) refereed critical editions, collected volumes, journal issues, compilations, translations, electronic publications, and public exhibits equivalent in scholarly significance to (a) or (b). Categories (b) and (c) may be mixed.
2. Candidates should provide copies of evaluations (reviews, citations, reports by other scholars, etc.) of scholarship published, accepted for publication, or exhibited since the time of promotion to associate professor.
3. Candidates should demonstrate national and/or international recognition as scholars.
4. Recommendation for promotion requires a positive assessment by the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the overall quality and quantity of a faculty member's scholarship.

The Committee will use its judgment in assessing the qualitative aspects of scholarship utilizing the solicited external reviews, unpublished peer reviews, and published reviews of published scholarship, if available.

D. Service

Service is an important responsibility of all faculty members that contributes to the University's performance of its larger mission. Although the nature of service activities will depend on a candidate's particular interests and abilities, service contributions are an essential part of being a good citizen of the University. The Department of History accepts and values scholarly service to the discipline or profession, service within the University, and public service at the local, state, national, or international level.

Under the University standards for the award of *tenure and/or promotion to associate professor*, the record must demonstrate a pattern of service to the University at one or more levels, to the discipline or profession, and/or to the local, state, national, and/or international communities.

In the Department of History, the following service expectations to meet University standards apply for the award of tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor:

1. Candidates are expected to engage in service chiefly at the departmental level, though service to other units, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, the University, faculty governance, the historical profession, and the broader community will be recognized.
2. Service will be evaluated with respect to quality as well as to quantity. For promotion to associate professor, this means fulfilling assigned service roles in the department's regular committees each year in which the candidate is not on leave; regular attendance and participation in departmental and committee meetings; and fulfilling two professional service roles including but not limited to reviewing books or manuscripts, organizing conference panels, giving public talks to non-academic audiences, serving as an officer in a professional organization, and/or serving as a member of an editorial board.

Under the University standards for *promotion to the rank of professor*, the record must demonstrate an ongoing pattern of service reflecting substantial contributions to the University at one or more levels, to the discipline or profession, and/or to the local, state, national, and/or international communities.

In the Department of History, the following service expectations to meet University standards apply for the promotion to the rank of professor:

1. Candidates are expected to engage in service at the following levels: the department, the College or University, *and* public or professional.
2. Service will be evaluated with respect to quality as well as to quantity. For promotion to full professor, this means meeting all expectations of service for those seeking promotion to associate professor plus the following: regular and engaged participation in service

roles beyond the department but within KU; and an ongoing pattern of professional service roles including but not limited to reviewing books or manuscripts, organizing conference panels, giving public talks to non-academic audiences, serving as an officer in a professional organization, and/or serving as a member of an editorial board.

E. Ratings for Performance

Using the criteria described above, the candidate's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service will be rated using the terms "excellent," "very good," "good," "marginal," or "poor," defined as follows:

1. "Excellent" means that the candidate substantially exceeds expectations for tenure and/or promotion to this rank.
2. "Very Good" means the candidate exceeds expectations for tenure and/or promotion to this rank.
3. "Good" means the candidate meets expectations for tenure and/or promotion to this rank.
4. "Marginal" means the candidate falls below expectations for tenure and/or promotion to this rank.
5. "Poor" means the candidate falls significantly below expectations for tenure and/or promotion to this rank.

Absent exceptional circumstances, no candidate may be recommended for promotion or tenure without meeting standards in all applicable areas of performance, and strong candidates are likely to exceed expectations in one or more categories.

III. Promotion and Tenure Procedures

The Department of History conducts the initial review of the candidate pursuant to the procedures and requirements of section 5 of Article VI of the FSRR in connection with the candidate's responsibility in the Department of History.

A. Promotion and Tenure Committee

Initial review by the Department of History shall evaluate the candidate's teaching, research, and service. In the Department of History, the initial review committee is the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Promotion and Tenure Committee will be composed of all tenured faculty in the department holding the appropriate rank. The full committee will sit in all cases involving recommendation for the awarding of tenure. In matters of promotion, assistant professors will be reviewed by associate and full professors; and associate professors by full professors.

No students or untenured faculty members, except unclassified academic staff with the rank equivalent to or higher than associate professor, shall serve on the Promotion and Tenure Committee or vote on any recommendation concerning promotion and/or tenure.

B. Initiation of Review

Prior to the beginning of the spring semester, the Provost notifies all faculty whose mandatory review year will be the following academic year, with copies provided to the unit administrators. If an assistant professor wishes to be considered for promotion and tenure prior to the mandatory review year, they must make a formal request to the Department Chair by the last day of March. If a tenured associate professor wishes to be considered for promotion to the rank of full professor, they similarly must make a formal request to the Department Chair at least two weeks prior to the College deadline to initiate the process. In any of these cases, the Department of History shall initiate procedures for evaluating the candidate for the award of promotion and/or tenure.

As part of the annual faculty evaluation process, the Department of History's Faculty Executive Board in consultation with the Department Chair shall consider the qualifications of all tenured faculty members below the rank of full professor, with a view toward possible promotion in rank during the following academic year. After considering a faculty member's qualifications, if the Department of History's Faculty Executive Board or Department Chair determines that those qualifications may warrant promotion in rank, the Department Chair shall inform the faculty member and recommend that they submit an application for promotion.

In the case of faculty members who hold joint appointments, each department conducts its own review in accordance with its own processes. The Department Chair will arrange with the Chair of the other department to coordinate solicitation of external evaluations and submission of each department's results to the College.

C. Certification Committees

In early April the Department Chair, who also serves as chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, will appoint a Certification Committee for each individual who will begin their mandatory review year the following academic year, and for each assistant or associate professor who has requested consideration for promotion as outlined above. Each Certification Committee considering an individual for promotion to associate will consist of four tenured members of the department; and each Certification Committee considering an individual for promotion to full will consist of four tenured full professors of the department. The Department Chair will endeavor to ensure as broad a representation on each committee as feasible and will select a Certification Committee chair to oversee the process from among those appointed.

The responsibilities of each Certification Committee are as follows:

1. Preliminary Review: For each assistant professor seeking to be considered for promotion and/or tenure during a year other than their mandatory year, and for each associate professor seeking to be considered for promotion to full, the Certification Committee will

undertake a preliminary review of the candidate's record of teaching, scholarship, and service. The Certification Committee will determine if the candidate meets the minimum requirements to be considered for promotion. The Department Chair will inform the candidate of the Certification Committee's decision in writing, and the candidate may appeal this finding to the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee. A Certification Committee does not undertake the preliminary review of the records of an assistant professor who goes up for promotion during the mandatory review year.

Certification by the preliminary review does not imply a positive recommendation for promotion and/or tenure, only that a faculty member has established the minimum record of teaching, scholarship, and service necessary to be reviewed formally by the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee. Recommendation for promotion and/or tenure requires a positive assessment of the overall quality and quantity of a faculty member's professional activities that goes beyond the minimum requirements for certification.

2. In all cases, the Certification Committee solicits from the candidate for tenure and/or promotion a list in rank order of at least six potential external evaluators of the candidate's choice. Emphasis shall be placed on selecting independent reviewers in the same or related discipline who hold academic rank or a professional position equal to or greater than the rank for which the candidate is being considered. Each name must be accompanied by contact information and a paragraph describing the scholar's credentials. These potential external evaluators must also conform to College guidelines on eligibility. The candidate is also invited to submit no more than two names of scholars who will not be asked to assess the candidate's materials.
2. After the candidate has submitted their list, the Certification Committee compiles a departmental list in rank order of potential external evaluators. This list may not overlap with the candidate's list, and may not include scholars that the candidate has excluded. The department's list must contain an equal number of evaluators with the candidate's list. Emphasis shall be placed on selecting independent reviewers in the same or related discipline who hold academic rank or a professional position equal to or greater than the rank for which the candidate is being considered. Each name must be accompanied by contact information and a paragraph describing the scholar's credentials. These potential external evaluators must also conform to College guidelines on eligibility.

D. Preparation of the Promotion and/or Tenure File

It is the responsibility of the candidate to complete the appropriate portions of official forms and to provide necessary documents and information in accordance with guidelines from the College and Provost's Office, with assistance from the department's administrative associate.

After a candidate's evaluations from outside reviewers and the candidate's statements and materials have been received by the department, the Certification Committee shall write a report summarizing the candidate's record of teaching, scholarship, and service in the format required

by the College and Provost's Office. This report must be provided to the Promotion and Tenure Committee at least two weeks prior to its meeting.

The draft report and the external evaluators' letters are to be kept confidential, with access limited to members of the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee, and to the department's administrative associates for the purpose of compiling and maintaining the files.

E. Initial Review Recommendations

The Department Chair will arrange a convenient time for a meeting of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, well in advance of the deadlines for submission of nominations to the College, with separate meetings for consideration of the promotion of assistant professors and associate professors. The Promotion and Tenure Committee's conclusions at the departmental level constitute the "Initial Review of the Candidate" for promotion and/or tenure. All participants should study the dossier of each candidate in advance of the meeting.

The first order of business in considering each candidate will be to accept the written report of the candidate's Certification Committee. Amendments may be offered by motion and approved by majority vote. Once accepted, this report shall serve as the basis for the Promotion and Tenure Committee's summary evaluation to be included in the candidate's dossier when it is sent to the College. After discussion, secret ballots will be cast to determine ratings for each area of performance and to recommend the candidate for promotion and/or tenure. Eligible faculty members must attend the meeting in person or via the procedure for virtual attendance to be eligible to vote. Those members otherwise unable to attend may submit signed letters in regard to individual candidacies that may be read or distributed to members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, but cannot vote.

The overall rating of performance by the Promotion and Tenure Committee in teaching, scholarship, and service will be the average of the ratings submitted by voters for each respective category, rounded to the nearest whole number. The majority of votes will determine the Promotion and Tenure Committee's overall recommendations for or against promotion and/or tenure.

Following the Promotion and Tenure Committee meetings, for each candidate, the Certification Committee shall prepare the Promotion and Tenure Committee's recommendation, ratings of performance, and summary evaluation sections on the appropriate forms and forward these to the Department Chair. The Department Chair shall indicate separately, in writing, whether they concur or disagree with the recommendations of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Department Chair shall then communicate in writing the recommendations of the Initial Review at the departmental level and their own concurrence or disagreement with these recommendations to the candidate along with a completed copy of the "Initial Review Summary for the Candidate" form. In the case of assistant professors not in the mandatory review year and associate professors, if the Promotion and Tenure Committee's recommendation is negative, the review will not be forwarded automatically to the College. In that case, the Department Chair will inform the candidate that they have the right to halt or proceed with forwarding the dossier to the College for further review.

F. Intermediate Review and Requests for Further Information

Before submission of the candidate's dossier to the College for intermediate review, the candidate may submit a written response to a negative recommendation for promotion and/or tenure by the Department of History, and/or to a final performance rating for teaching, scholarship, or service that is below the level of "good" in the evaluation section of the recommendation. As long as it is provided before the deadline for submission, this response will go forward with the candidate's dossier to the next level of review by the College Committee on Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (CCAPT).

Any requests for additional information from the CCAPT, University Committee on Promotion and Tenure (UCPT), or other University administrator involved in certifying a promotion and/or tenure case shall be sent to the Department Chair, who shall immediately provide a copy to the candidate and consult with the Certification Committee concerning any substantive issues. The Department Chair, in consultation with the Promotion and Tenure Committee, shall prepare the department's response in accordance with the initial review procedures. The candidate shall be afforded an opportunity to participate in the preparation of the department's response, as well as to submit their own documentation or written response to such requests.

Appendix C: Post-tenure Review Criteria and Procedures

POLICY OWNER: DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

REVIEW, APPROVAL & CHANGE HISTORY:

Approved by vote of the faculty in the Department of History on November 18, 2015.

Approved by vote of the faculty in the Department of History on November 28, 2018.

I. General Principles

In accordance with Board of Regents requirements (II.C.8), Article 7 Section 4 of the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations, and the University Policy on Post-tenure Review (see <http://policy.ku.edu/university-faculty/post-tenure-review>), the Department of History, hereafter referred to as the History Department or the department, has adopted these expectations and procedures for conducting Post-tenure Review. Post-tenure Review is a process for periodic peer evaluation of faculty performance that provides an opportunity for a long-term assessment of a faculty member's accomplishments and future directions in the areas of teaching/advising, scholarship, and service.

Post-tenure Review must be conducted in a manner that respects the rights of faculty members involved, including academic freedom, tenure, and due process. In addition, all those involved in the evaluation process must recognize that it is a confidential personnel matter and take appropriate steps to protect confidentiality.

II. Period for Review

Post-tenure Review is conducted on a seven-year cycle and covers the seven-year period leading up to the review. It covers and is based on: the six prior annual evaluation letters from the Chair to the faculty member; the faculty member's activities since the last annual evaluation; and documentation of any appeals by the faculty member. The cycle is restarted if a faculty member is evaluated for promotion or is awarded a distinguished professorship. Some years may be excluded from the cycle in accordance with the University policy, and the review may be postponed if the faculty member is on leave during the year of review. The Chair of the History Department shall notify faculty members it has scheduled for post-tenure review no later than March 15th in the spring semester preceding the academic year of review.

III. Unit Expectations

All tenured faculty members must meet academic responsibilities in the areas of teaching/advising, scholarship, and service. Unless otherwise specified by the job description or differential allocation of effort, the ordinary allocation of effort is 40% research, 40% teaching/advising, and 20% service. Post-tenure review criteria shall be consistent with criteria for annual evaluation listed in the department's Faculty Evaluation Plan (FEP), which are part of the department's bylaws. If the department revises its FEP, its post-tenure criteria will incorporate those revisions.

The Department of History has defined its standards and expectations for research, teaching/advising, and service in its annual evaluation procedures. The expectations for post-tenure review are consistent with these standards, with overall productivity commensurate to the seven-year period under review.

A. Criteria for Meeting Expectations in Research

Tenure is granted to faculty members with the expectation that they will continue to be active scholars. The record must demonstrate an established scholarly career, as reflected in such factors as a substantial and ongoing pattern of research and publication and other evidence of an active and productive scholarly career.

"Scholarship" in the History Department includes the following activities, which have varying degrees of importance:

1. Publication of a book (monograph, edited text, research-based textbook, or edited collection, whether in print or online);
2. Publication of articles in peer-reviewed or refereed journals or invited collections;
3. Presentations at scholarly conferences and invited presentations, including keynote speeches or invitations to present, leading toward publication;
4. Manuscripts submitted for publication; research that is completed and ready for publication.
5. Professional honors and awards; journal editorships.

B. Criteria for Meeting Expectations in Teaching/Advising

The faculty member's record must demonstrate continued effectiveness and growth as a teacher, as reflected in such factors as mastery of the subject matter, strong classroom teaching skills, an ongoing commitment to student learning, and active involvement in providing advice and support for students outside the classroom. The candidate's teaching should reflect knowledge of their field, and show that they are effective in encouraging students' interest, helping them to think critically and to apply their knowledge, pointing them toward the broader implications of their study, and generally encouraging their development as perceptive readers and articulate writers. The record must also give indication of responsible fulfillment of all duties associated with teaching, including timely holding of class sessions, efficient administration of on-line content, making themselves regularly available for consultation in-person and electronically, grading and commenting on assignments in a timely and sufficient manner, upholding fair expectations and criteria for student work (as judged by standards in the discipline), adequately preparing for class and making effective use of class time, reflecting about pedagogy, maintaining mastery of class subject matter, and actively engaging in advising students.

C. Criteria for Meeting Expectations in Service

The record should indicate significant participation in activities necessary to the successful functioning of the department, College, and/or University, including significant service on committees and participation at departmental meetings. In addition, a record of substantial contributions to the larger university community, the profession, or the discipline at the local, regional, national, or international level (e.g. memberships on committees or task forces, memberships of editorial or advisory boards, student recruitment, administration, reviewing grant

applications, judging academic awards competitions, offices in professional organizations, conducting ad hoc workshops, fund raising, organizing conferences or lectures, etc.) is expected. A record demonstrating leadership at the department, College, University, or professional level indicates meritorious service beyond minimum expectations.

IV. Relation to the Annual Evaluation

The Post-tenure Review shall be conducted by the History Department's Post-tenure Review Committee (PRC), excluding the Department Chair, pursuant to the department's annual Faculty Evaluation Policy. Post-tenure Review and annual evaluation are therefore parts of a single process.

For faculty members under Post-tenure Review, that review is merged into the annual evaluation process for that year. Each faculty member subject to Post-tenure Review shall also produce an annual evaluation report for the Faculty Executive Board (FEB); the FEB shall produce annual evaluation scores for such faculty members in respect of Teaching/advising, Research and Service in accordance with the History Department's bylaws, such scores not being part of the Post-tenure Review. The PRC and FEB shall meet and confer to ensure that the PRC's evaluations of faculty members are consistent with those of the FEB.

V. Joint Appointments

The faculty member shall provide both of their units with copies of that faculty member's Statement section of the Post-tenure Review File (reflecting the representative effort in each unit), and a current curriculum vitae. The review shall go forward with each unit's Post-tenure Review Committee preparing a separate evaluation and forwarding considerations by each Chair and/or Director to the Dean. In the case of a jointly-appointed faculty and unclassified academic staff member, the primary unit is responsible for the administrative protocols of engaging the secondary unit in the solicitation and collection of feedback relative to the evaluation of performance expectations in the secondary unit.

VI. Post-tenure Review Committee

The History Department's Post-tenure Review Committee (PRC) shall consist of three members, not including the Department Chair. Its members shall be drawn from the FEB, elected by the department as provided in the department's bylaws. Only tenured faculty may serve on the PRC. If all the elected members of the FEB do not hold the required ranks to serve on the PRC in respect of the cases under review, those ineligible to the PRC shall be replaced by alternates of the appropriate rank identified during the election of the FEB (in the order of the number of votes cast for each candidate). The History Department's most recent vote on FEB membership shall be preserved and shall constitute an election of alternates to fill the place(s) of any PRC member(s) who withdraw(s) or is (or are) disqualified based on a conflict of interest or ineligibility. At least one member of the PRC (excluding the Department Chair) must hold the rank of full professor and a full professor must chair the PRC. The Department Chair may sit in during PRC meetings and deliberate but may not vote on Post-tenure Review determinations.

No person may serve on the PRC in a year in which any of the following is undergoing Post-tenure Review: (1) the person themselves; (2) their spouse or partner; (3) a faculty member with whom the person is engaged in collaborative research. A PRC member who believes that there may be a conflict of interest should withdraw from the PRC. If a faculty member who is undergoing Post-tenure Review believes that a PRC member has a conflict of interest, the faculty member may object to the inclusion of that person on the PRC. If that person declines to withdraw, the remaining PRC members shall consider the basis for the alleged conflict and decide the question of eligibility.

VII. Preparation of the Post-tenure Review File

Post-tenure Review shall be conducted on the basis of a faculty member's file that summarizes their research, teaching/advising, and service. In contrast to evaluation for promotion and tenure, copies of publications, original student evaluations and outside reviews of scholarship are not required and should not be submitted.

The faculty member under review shall provide a brief narrative statement of their accomplishments in research, teaching/advising, and service during the review period as they relate to their long-term career path and goals. In addition, the faculty member shall submit a current curriculum vitae and a list of any additional activities not covered on the curriculum vitae. The Chair shall furnish copies of the faculty member's annual evaluation letters and any appeal documentation by the faculty member for the six years constituting the review period. The PRC shall rely on the evaluations contained in these letters.

VIII. Post-tenure Review: The Evaluation

For Post-tenure Review, the PRC shall review the faculty member's file; the PRC shall evaluate achievements in the areas of research, teaching/advising, and service and provide a comprehensive evaluation of the faculty member's overall performance. Applying the expectations defined in the department's bylaws, the PRC shall consider only the faculty member's overall performance and shall evaluate whether it (1) exceeds expectations, (2) meets expectations, or (3) fails to meet expectations. In making its evaluation, the PRC shall bear in mind that faculty members have differing responsibilities and make different kinds of contributions to the mission of the department, the College, and the University; that a faculty member's activities vary over time according to their strengths, interests, and career path; and that innovative work may take time to reach fruition and may sometimes fail.

The PRC shall prepare a written report summarizing its evaluation of each faculty member under review. The report shall provide a narrative description of the faculty member's activities, an explanation of the PRC's evaluation, and recommendations or suggestions for acknowledgement of contributions and the future development of the faculty member. The PRC shall provide a copy of the evaluation to the faculty member, who may submit a written response for inclusion in the Post-tenure Review file before it is forwarded to the Chair. The department shall retain records of the PRC's deliberations.

The Post-tenure Review evaluation shall be considered as part of the annual Faculty Evaluation Policy and the Chair shall discuss the Post-tenure Review evaluation with the faculty member as part of that annual process. Any such discussion should concentrate on the future professional

development of the faculty member with an aim of enhancing meritorious work and improving less satisfactory performance, including adoption of a performance improvement plan if necessary. Any action on the Post-tenure Review is within the scope of the Faculty Evaluation Policy and must be taken under that policy.

IX. Consideration of the Evaluation by the Chair and Dean

The PRC shall copy its evaluation (along with any response by the faculty member) to the Chair. If the Chair agrees or disagrees with the evaluation, they shall report that agreement or disagreement, with reasons, in writing to the faculty member; place a copy in his or her Post-tenure Review file; and send a copy to the PRC. The Chair may ask the PRC to provide additional information or reconsider its evaluation. If the Chair disagrees with a positive evaluation by the PRC, the faculty member may submit a written response which shall be included in his or her file. The Chair shall forward the file to the Dean of the College by the required date, and may provide additional information if requested by the Dean after consulting with the PRC. Post-tenure Review evaluations at all levels will ultimately be placed in the faculty member's personnel file.

X. Appeals

Following the completion of the review, if a disagreement between the PRC, the Chair or the Dean cannot be resolved or if the faculty member wishes to appeal an evaluation of "fails to meet expectations" in the overall evaluation, the matter shall be handled as an appeal under the History Department's annual Faculty Evaluation Policy.

Appendix D. Faculty Evaluation Criteria and Procedures

POLICY OWNER: DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

REVIEW, APPROVAL & CHANGE HISTORY:

Approved by vote of the faculty in the Department of History on November 28, 2018.

Approved by vote of the faculty in the Department of History on April 17, 2019.

I. Introduction

The History Department subscribes to the University of Kansas Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct as approved by the Faculty Senate in revised form in 2016 and subsequently amended. The faculty of the History Department at the University of Kansas are expected to demonstrate commitment to effective teaching, advising, and mentoring both in the classroom and with individual undergraduate and graduate students; to engage in professional research; to provide service to the department, College, and University, to local, national, and international communities, and/or to disciplinary and interdisciplinary organizations; and to work in a collegial and professional manner with department colleagues, staff, and students. Faculty duties are set forth in Article IV of the Faculty Code, and the History Department expects its faculty to live up to those responsibilities. Within the context of the Faculty Code of Conduct, the duties and expectations of History Department faculty and the means by which they are evaluated are presented below. Criteria and procedures for faculty evaluation have been adopted through faculty participation and by majority vote of the department faculty; they are to function within the Department of History's overall commitment to academic freedom and the system of tenure.

II. Statement of Performance Expectations

- A. Unit Expectations: These criteria are based on Promotion and Tenure Standards in the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations, Article VI, Section 2. Teaching, research, and service should be evaluated as to quality as well as quantity of effort, and with respect to their contribution to the department, University, the historical profession, and other entities. The Department of History expects faculty to devote 40 percent of their effort to research, 40 percent to teaching, and 20 percent to service, unless the faculty member has an approved Differential Allocation of Effort (DAE) described in the section on Faculty Appointments. Likewise, teaching professors are expected to fulfill teaching, advising, and service obligations with an allocation of effort commensurate with their contractual requirements, unless they have an approved DAE. A teaching professor is typically expected to devote 10 percent of their effort to research, 75 percent to teaching, and 10 percent to service, with the additional 5 percent of effort allocated by contract to one of those three categories.

1. Research

Regular faculty are expected to engage in original historical research and submit this research for peer evaluation, review, criticism, and publication. Publication in refereed journals and in books is the most significant measure of scholarly productivity, but other forms of publication and public engagement are also valued. Competitive awards and grants from agencies of national or international standing and internal grants are another useful index of recognition for research. Scholarly production can take many forms. These include, but are not restricted to: electronic publishing, databases, translations, editing academic journals and collected works, and preparation of studies for governmental agencies and non-governmental organizations. Participation in symposia, conferences, and professional meetings is another important outlet for publicizing and testing one's research. The research of teaching professors may be of a historical nature or related to pedagogy and should be publicized in a similar range of venues.

2. Teaching, including Advising.

- a. Regular faculty are normally expected to teach four courses per academic year. Teaching professors normally teach six courses per academic year. Evidence of effective teaching must be demonstrated and furnished; this evidence may take several forms. Good teaching requires continual application and effort. This includes maintaining credentials as a scholar and keeping abreast of new developments in the discipline.
- b. All faculty including teaching professors are expected to engage in the advising and mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students. The Faculty Executive Board will consider advising in its annual evaluation of each faculty member. Faculty are expected to be familiar with the schedule of course offerings and requirements for the major, minor, and graduate degrees; to make themselves regularly available for consultation at publicly announced times; to assist students in making well-informed academic and career choices; to appropriately refer students to campus support offices; and to direct student theses and examinations, as appropriate.

3. Service.

Service can take many forms. Departmental service is expected of every faculty member, including teaching professors. Service to the College, University, profession, and/or public is expected of every faculty member based on their career stage. Participation in professional organizations, editorial boards, and public service is to be encouraged and recognized. It adds to the professional competence of the individual, provides contact with a larger circle of peers, and in turn brings prestige to the University and serves its mission in other ways. "Outreach" activities are not necessarily restricted to service but may contribute to a faculty member's profile in teaching and scholarship. Service expectations are adjusted in accordance with the faculty member's rank and percentage appointment in the History Department and contractual allocation of effort.

- B. Standards for Acceptable Performance: On the basis of information provided in an evaluation portfolio, the Faculty Executive Board will assess each faculty member's performance in their responsibilities of research, teaching, and service on a scale of:

Excellent
Very Good
Good
Marginal
Targeted for Improvement

Section IV below outlines specific criteria to be considered under each of the three categories of performance.

- C. Improvement Plans: An assessment of "targeted for improvement" in any of the three categories of teaching, research, or service responsibilities during any given year will lead to intervention by the chairperson. If in the opinion of the chairperson, this is not due to an unusual one-time factor such as illness, but rather constitutes a failure to meet academic responsibilities, the chairperson will so inform the faculty member in the written evaluation. In such a case, the chairperson, after meeting with the faculty member, shall together with the faculty member develop a written Improvement Plan to improve the faculty member's performance. The plan may include appropriate provisions for faculty renewal and development, or for other appropriate interventions, such as counseling, medical leave, or a change in teaching assignments. The chairperson may call upon the University administration for assistance in constructing such a plan, including provision for additional resources, where needed. A faculty member may reject all or part of any Improvement Plan recommended to aid performance, but the faculty member must understand that a sustained overall failure to meet academic responsibilities is a basis for dismissal. If the chairperson and faculty member agree on the plan, it is to be signed by both parties. In any case, it is to be maintained in the faculty member's permanent file and made available to the FEB. Continued failure to demonstrate progress in an area targeted for improvement three years following development of the Improvement Plan will result in initiation of a process for recommendation for dismissal by the Chairperson, following consultation with department faculty. The Chairperson shall consult annually with an appropriate Dean on the progress of any faculty member with an active Improvement Plan.
- D. Sustained Failure to Meet Performance Expectations: Based upon the judgment that there has been a sustained overall failure to meet academic responsibilities, the chairperson may recommend to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences who may recommend to the Provost who may recommend to the Chancellor that a tenured faculty member be dismissed, following consultation with department faculty. The chairperson will facilitate the handling of this situation in accordance with provisions of the Faculty Code and University

policies. The finding of sustained failure must not abuse academic freedom or be used as a cover for discriminatory, unfair, arbitrary, or capricious dismissal.

III. Annual Evaluation Process

The annual evaluation process begins in January and proceeds through the spring term of each year.

- A. The Faculty Executive Board: The Faculty Executive Board (FEB), as the entity responsible for conducting the annual evaluation of faculty (including teaching professors), consists of three members, who are elected according to the policies and procedures provided in the Department of History's bylaws. It is the domain of this committee to complete evaluations and make recommendations to the chairperson on all matters relevant to the annual review of faculty, including later recommendations concerning merit salary for department members.
- B. Timeline for Annual Report Portfolio Evaluation
 1. The FEB informs department members when portfolios are due and sends a general invitation to request a personal conference with them before it begins its evaluation for the year. (December)
 2. Annual Report Portfolios due on the date in January specified by the FEB.
 3. FEB members examines individual faculty portfolios; they may also consult previous years' self-evaluations and final evaluation letters. (February)
 4. The FEB makes written recommendations on evaluation to the Chair based on group discussion of each colleague's record by the entire FEB. (March)
 5. The Chair provides written evaluations to faculty members and the opportunity for consultation and appeals. (March/April)
- C. Annual Report Portfolio Preparations: Each faculty member must assemble a report for the preceding calendar year that includes the following documents:
 1. Two copies of a written self-evaluation of the faculty member's achievements in research, teaching, and service, including a description of those achievements and justification of the self-evaluation for each category following the guidelines below, using the self-evaluation form provided below.
 2. Two copies of an up-to-date curriculum vitae that follows the standard template required for all promotion and tenure applications provided below.
 3. Evidence of research activity should be limited to scholarship published or submitted for publication and grants awarded during the review period. Faculty should submit evidence verifying submission, receipt, and/or publication of manuscripts or grants. Additional research activity, such as conference presentations, should be listed on the c.v. Unpublished materials, works in progress, and materials published in earlier years should not be included.

4. Evidence of teaching activity should include all student evaluations and, as appropriate, any peer evaluations of teaching, along with syllabi for all courses for the preceding calendar year. No supporting documentation should be included from previous years.

D. Annual Report Portfolio Review and Evaluation

1. Annual evaluation takes into account the research, teaching, and service of the faculty member. All faculty members are normally required to be involved in all three areas of endeavor. In assessing a faculty member's performance, the FEB will take into consideration the allocation of effort during the year under consideration and percentage appointment in the History Department. The FEB will evaluate the research, teaching, advising, and service of teaching professors in a similar manner, taking into consideration their contractual expectations.
2. The FEB will evaluate departmental colleagues on the basis of their self-evaluation and accompanying materials according to the guidelines below. The FEB makes an independent judgment for each faculty member and is not bound by a faculty member's self-rating. If a faculty member neglects to provide the required materials, then the FEB will mark them as "targeted for improvement" in any or all of the three categories. Faculty members on leave still must supply the required materials. Late submission of self-evaluations will be handled according to the policy for appeals below.
3. As part of the teaching portfolio, every faculty member must submit all student teaching evaluations from the year under review for all formally scheduled classes for which the University requires evaluations. At the conclusion of the FEB's deliberations, the portfolio, including student evaluations, is returned to the faculty member. It is faculty members' responsibility to retain student evaluations in their own records for possible future consultation.
4. The FEB will retain a copy of each faculty member's c.v. and self-evaluation for at least three years for possible consultation during subsequent annual review cycles.

E. Annual Evaluation Feedback Process

1. The FEB will complete a written evaluation of each faculty member's performance for the previous calendar year and submit this evaluation to the Department Chair.
2. The chairperson will transmit the FEB's evaluation to each faculty member in a letter, which may include additional remarks from the chairperson. Faculty members may schedule a meeting with the chairperson to discuss the evaluation, expectations for the future, continued professional growth, strategies for improvement, contract renewal, progress toward tenure and promotion, or other professional matters. The chairperson will schedule a mandatory meeting with any faculty member rated as "targeted for improvement" in any of the three areas of performance. A copy of the written evaluation shall be retained in the faculty member's personnel file in the unit.

F. Post-tenure Review and the Annual Evaluation Process

1. The Post-tenure Review shall be conducted by the History Department's Post-tenure Review Committee (PRC) consisting of tenured members of the Faculty Executive Board, in accordance with the History Department's Post-tenure Review Criteria and Procedures, annual Faculty Evaluation Policy, and the University Post-tenure Review policy. Post-

tenure Review and annual evaluation are parts of a single process. Therefore, any action on the Post-tenure Review that is within the scope of the Faculty Evaluation Policy must be taken pursuant to that policy. Accordingly, unless the Post-tenure Review indicates the failure to satisfy an Improvement Plan that was previously in place and performance that constitutes sustained failure to meet academic responsibilities, a recommendation for dismissal cannot follow from Post-tenure Review.

2. For faculty members under Post-tenure Review, that review is merged into the annual evaluation process for that year. Each faculty member subject to Post-Tenure Review shall also produce an annual report portfolio for the FEB.

G. Outcomes of the Annual Performance Evaluation

1. The annual evaluation process yields multiple outcomes: discussions influencing individual career planning and overall departmental development; recommendations for teaching or research awards; and a cumulative database for consideration with regard to post-tenure review, sabbatical evaluations, faculty development or improvement activities, and differential allocations of effort.

As part of the annual faculty evaluation process, the Department of History's Faculty Executive Board in consultation with the Department Chair shall consider the qualifications of all tenured faculty members below the rank of full professor, with a view toward possible promotion in rank during the following academic year. After considering a faculty member's qualifications, if the Department of History's Faculty Executive Board or Department Chair determines that those qualifications may warrant promotion in rank, the Department Chair shall inform the faculty member and recommend that they submit an application for promotion.

The annual evaluation process is also used in recommending the awarding of merit salary increases. Although evaluations for merit increases are based primarily on achievements during the previous calendar year, the FEB's assessments encompass both short- and long-term perspectives. The basic question posed by the Faculty Executive Board in evaluating each faculty member is not: "What is the quality of this work compared to that of other faculty?" The Board asks only how the faculty member's work compares to the established guidelines stipulated in section IV below.

2. *Calculation of Merit Salary Increases.* The FEB has traditionally allocated increments each year based on a scale of 0 to 20 possible for full-time faculty in history, enabling interannual comparisons and the accumulation of increments over multiple years when no funds for merit salary increases are allocated. The cumulation of increments is one major procedure that the chairperson uses for allocating merit salary increases. The exact allocation of these funds also depends on other factors, such as the percentage of permanent appointment within the History Department. Each year, the FEB recommends to the chairperson that merit salary increments be awarded to faculty members by the following

procedure, based on allocation of effort (AOE) to research, teaching, and service during the year under review:

For each faculty member, the FEB divides a total of 20 possible merit increments among the three categories of research, teaching, and service according to each member's assigned Allocation of Effort for the year. Within each category, faculty members will be awarded a percent of possible increments (%increments) in proportion to their rating: 100% of possible increments for Excellent; 75% of possible increments for Very Good; 50% of possible increments for Good; 12.5% of possible increments for Marginal; and zero increments for Targeted for Improvement. The categories are then added together for a total award of merit.

For example, for faculty members with a standard 40-40-20 Allocation of Effort, the possible increments are distributed as follows:

In research and teaching:

Excellent	100 percent	8 increments
Very Good	75 percent	6 increments
Good	50 percent	4 increments
Marginal	12.5 percent	1 increments
Targeted for Improvement	0 percent	0 increments

In service:

Excellent	100 percent	4 increments
Very Good	75 percent	3 increments
Good	50 percent	2 increments
Marginal	12.5 percent	0.5 increment
Targeted for Improvement	0 percent	0 increments

For accounting purposes, this procedure is equivalent to the following equation:

$$\text{Total increments} = [\text{AOE}_{\text{research}} (\% \text{increments}_{\text{research}}) 20] + [\text{AOE}_{\text{teaching}} (\% \text{increments}_{\text{teaching}}) 20] + [\text{AOE}_{\text{service}} (\% \text{increments}_{\text{service}}) 20]$$

For example, if a faculty member with a 100 percent appointment in history and a 40-40-20 allocation of effort receives "excellent" in all areas, then the FEB would award 20 total increments calculated as follows:

$$[(.4)(1)20 + (.4)(1)20 + (.2)(1)20] = [8 + 8 + 4] = 20 \text{ total increments}$$

For example, if a teaching professor with a 10-70-20 allocation of effort receives "good" in all areas, then the FEB would award 10 total increments calculated as follows:

$$[(.1)(.5)20 + (.7)(.5)20 + .2(.5)20] .5 = [1 + 7 + 2] = 10 \text{ total increments}$$

If a faculty member has Differential Allocations of Effort for each semester, AOE in each area is calculated by adding together half of a faculty member's AOE's for each semester. For example, if a faculty member is on research leave in the spring (100-0-0) and returns to regular service in the fall (40-40-20), their combined AOE for the year would be 70-20-10.

For years in which merit salary increases are available, the chairperson will determine the value of each increment by dividing the total sum available for distribution by the total number of increments earned by faculty members as assessed by the FEB since the last year in which a merit pay increase was granted. Faculty members will each receive a merit increase equivalent to the number and value of the increments earned, adjusted for their percent appointment in the History Department. For any year in which there is no sum available for distribution, increments earned by each faculty member shall be carried forward and cumulated until a year in which a sum is available for distribution. When funds become available and merit salary increases are allocated, the chairperson should provide an explanation to each faculty member regarding how their individual merit increase was determined, including the value of increments credited and any additional considerations that went into these determinations. These explanations for all faculty should also be reported to the FEB. This procedure for allocating merit salary increases shall not be amended by Differential Allocation of Effort agreements.

3. *Appeals.* If a faculty member has been informed that their overall performance fails to meet academic responsibilities, or if they are otherwise dissatisfied with the evaluation, the faculty member may request a review by the Faculty Executive Board within one month of receiving their written evaluation from the Department Chair. A faculty member may submit a statement and add other information or materials to the file for review by the FEB. The Faculty Executive Board will issue a non-binding recommendation on the appropriateness of this conclusion to the chairperson. The chairperson may change the evaluation after receiving the committee's decision, or may choose not to do so. The faculty member's statement, FEB recommendation, and chair's decision will become a permanent part of the faculty member's personnel file within the academic unit and shall be available to the faculty member.

Should the faculty member not find resolution at the unit level appeal, the faculty member has the right to appeal this evaluation through appropriate administrative channels. The faculty member may request a review by a faculty committee designated to hear such matters in the College. The chairperson may change the evaluation after receiving the committee's recommendation, or may choose not to do so. In any event, the faculty member's appeal, committee report, and chair's decision will become a permanent part of the faculty member's personnel file within the Department of History and shall be available to the faculty member.

IV. Guidelines for Self-Evaluations

The following guidelines pertain to all faculty members with an allocation of effort of 40% research, 40% teaching, and 20% service. Faculty members with a Differential Allocation of Effort or joint appointments will have adjusted expectations. When appropriate, self-evaluations should explain adjusted expectations. Self-evaluations should address quality as well as quantity of effort and consider the faculty member's contribution to the department, University, the historical profession, and other entities.

A. Research

The Department of History expects its tenured and tenure-track faculty to be research engaged and productive scholars. Research engagement is the active involvement of faculty in working toward the goal of publishing. There are five basic levels of research engagement.

- Level I: Applying for grants, locating and evaluating source material, and composing draft manuscripts.
- Level II: Presenting findings at academic conferences.
- Level III: Submitting proposals and/or manuscripts to appropriate venues for consideration for publication.
- Level IV: Manuscripts accepted for publication, revising and editing final product before publication. (Note: a pre-completion contract is not considered acceptance; a completed manuscript must be formally accepted by a publisher.)
- Level V: Publications appear in print and/or online. Receiving major national and international research fellowships.

Scholarly production can take many forms. Those most valued by the history profession include articles, edited volumes, journal issues, and monographs in peer-reviewed venues, and competitive awards and grants. Textbooks; document collections and translated works (both of which should include significant annotations and/or introductory passages written by the faculty member); reports for public agencies and non-governmental organizations; the rapidly diversifying range of databases and publications encompassed by the digital humanities; and other published works are also valued.

During its annual review, the first step of the Faculty Executive Board is to determine whether each faculty member is engaged in research. A faculty member is deemed an unengaged researcher who has more than four years of service at KU, has not published within the four previous calendar years (inclusive of the review period), and has not moved beyond the second

level of engagement. Unengaged faculty will be targeted for improvement, and intervention will occur.

The second step is to rate each faculty member's research according to their level of engagement, productivity, and impact. Except where otherwise noted, all activities and accomplishments must have occurred within the calendar year of the evaluation period.

- Excellent*: Publication of a single-authored, peer-reviewed or refereed book with a respected press or a collaborative book of the same standard in which the faculty member's contribution is equal to three or more published articles; or, publication of three or more pieces of peer-reviewed or refereed scholarship in respected journals or edited volumes with a respected press; or, making a significant impact on the profession as demonstrated by award(s) won for previously published scholarship, a career achievement award given by a scholarly organization or institution; or some other major achievement in scholarship explained by the self-evaluation.

- Very good*: Publication of peer-reviewed or refereed scholarship in the form of a journal article or book chapter with a respected journal or press; or publication of an edited volume, textbook, document reader, translation, or major work in the digital humanities; or editing a peer-reviewed academic journal; or receipt of a major national or international research fellowship. A major fellowship is defined as one included on the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences list of Agencies Pre-approved for Supplemental Salary Funding. Faculty who receive major grants which do not appear on this list may submit an explanation as to why their award should be considered major. For teaching professors, this level of research accomplishment will be credited as "excellent."

- Good*: Research engaged at levels I to IV.

- Marginal*: Research engaged, but without advancement beyond level II during the three previous years, inclusive of the year under evaluation, for faculty with at least three full years of service at KU. For teaching professors, this consideration applies to the six previous years, inclusive of the of the year under evaluation.

- Targeted for improvement*: Not research engaged; or repeated marginal performance in research over two years, including the year under review; or for receiving an official sanction from a University tribunal or body that proscribed conduct in regard to research as outlined in the Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct.

Note: Book reviews should not count as research, but as service; however, review articles involving multiple works should count as research. Individuals should receive credit for publications only for the year of publication. Acceptance of a manuscript is part of being research engaged and counts as "good."

B. Teaching

For the purpose of evaluation, “good” teaching that meets departmental expectations is defined as instruction of regularly scheduled classes; supervision of independent study, theses, and dissertations; membership on masters and doctoral committees; making themselves regularly available for consultation in-person and electronically; and regular communication with students, as appropriate to the faculty member’s Allocation of Effort and career level. Student advising and mentoring are also a part of the teaching responsibilities of every faculty member. When evaluating their teaching, faculty members should directly address the question: *How have your courses and advising contributed to the overall good of the department and student learning?* This might include discussion of new teaching innovations or assignments, efforts to develop teaching approaches and materials, Center for Teaching Excellence activities, and/or required supplemental materials (course syllabi and student evaluations).

A rating of “excellent” or “very good” requires a more comprehensive self-evaluation statement of no more than two pages in which faculty members also reflect on their approach to classroom teaching, how they organize course materials and activities, how they assess student achievement of course goals, and how their teaching experiences have shaped their ongoing goals and practices as a teacher. Other supplemental materials may be helpful to justify a rating of very good or excellent. These materials may include peer review letters, a portfolio of teaching materials, and student materials.

When arranging peer reviews of teaching, please have the reviewer answer these questions: Are the intellectual goals for students well-articulated and congruent with the course content and mission? Are there opportunities (in or out of class) for students to practice and demonstrate the skills embedded in course goals? Are there noteworthy course structures or procedures that contribute to the achievement of understanding by students? Is the performance asked of students appropriate for course goals and the level of the course? Has this faculty member made a sincere effort to ensure that students achieve the goals for the course? Is there evidence the faculty member has developed their teaching practices based on past teaching experiences?

- Excellent*: Recognition for teaching excellence as evidenced by a major award; and/or fulfilling accomplishment 1 *and* accomplishments 2 or 3 for a very good rating; or some other major achievement in teaching explained by the self-evaluation.

- Very good*: In addition to meeting basic departmental expectations, accomplishing one of the following:

- 1) Demonstration of innovative teaching both in terms of content and pedagogy. This must be demonstrated by the reflection statement and supplemental materials.

2) Contribution to the department's undergraduate teaching needs that significantly exceeds unit expectations. This can be demonstrated by a) the faculty member offering one half or more of their course offerings during the calendar year that fulfill core requirements for the major (e.g. HIST 301 or 696) and/or requirements of the KU Core); or b) teaching history courses with exceptionally large enrollments or extensive, closely supervised writing requirements (especially classes without Graduate Teaching Assistants); or c) advising 3 or more undergraduates in their honors theses or in research projects that require similar effort; or d) some combination that represents a comparable effort.

3) Contribution to the department's graduate teaching and advising needs that significantly exceeds unit expectations. This should be demonstrated by one or more of the following: a) having two or more PhD students successfully defend their dissertations; b) serving as the officially designated second reader for four successfully defended dissertations; c) advising four or more students working on dissertations or theses or actively preparing exam portfolios; (Each student must not have been working on their dissertation or thesis for more than three years or exam portfolio for more than a year.) d) serving on a total of six PhD portfolio exams, dissertation defense committees, or MA exams; or e) some combination that represents a comparable effort. For example, a faculty member who has one student successfully defend a dissertation, advises one other dissertating student, and serves as a second reader would qualify for a "very good" rating. So would a faculty member who serves on three exams and advises two students preparing exam portfolios.

•*Good*: Meets the faculty member's contractually obligated number of courses with a reasonable distribution across class levels, types, and sizes. Satisfactorily contributes to the teaching and advising of graduate and undergraduate students.

•*Marginal*: Does not adequately meet departmental expectations for offering a rotation of courses distributed across class levels, types, and sizes. Disengaged from student teaching or advising or does not make themselves regularly available for consultation in-person and electronically.

•*Targeted for improvement*: Repeated marginal performance in teaching over two years, including the year under review. Significant problems in meeting reasonable student expectations regarding quality of instruction, availability, and feedback as evident in student or peer evaluations or repeated student complaints; irresponsible student advising; or, receiving an official sanction from a University tribunal or body that proscribed conduct in regard to teaching as outlined in the Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct.

C. Service

Service that meets or exceeds unit expectations involves fulfilling assigned service roles within the department and regular attendance at departmental and committee meetings, as appropriate to the faculty member's Allocation of Effort and percent appointment. Individuals with joint appointments unavoidably carry a heavier service burden and may be credited for these extra efforts. The Chair should make every effort to assign joint appointees one-half of the responsibilities of full-time appointments. In the event that this is not possible, service responsibilities that a joint appointee has in a second department should be credited as "service beyond the department." Departmental officership is considered an assigned service duty within the department and receives additional compensation; thus, serving as associate chair, undergraduate director, or graduate director should be considered as moderate additional service. Other forms of exceptional service to the department may be considered as substantial service commitments. Book and manuscript reviews are considered service to the profession.

For the purpose of evaluation, examples of substantial service commitments outside the department are under list A; moderate commitments are under list B. For the purpose of comparing service commitments on these two lists, three moderate commitments on list B are considered equivalent to one substantial commitment on list A. If a service role is not listed, please describe the duties and time commitment in comparison to one of the listed service roles.

List A:

- College or University Promotion and Tenure Committee
- College or University Sabbatical Committee
- CUSA, CGS, CAC, CECD, UCCC
- Faculty Senate
- Organizing an academic conference
- Search committee in another department
- External evaluator for promotion and/or tenure
- External evaluator for another department's program review
- Editorial duties not included under Research
- Officership in another department (uncompensated with course reduction or summer salary)
- Directing a Hall Center Seminar or similar seminar
- Major leadership position in a professional organization

List B:

- Committee membership in another department (if no reduction in service for a joint appointment)
- Book or manuscript review
- Editorial board of an academic journal or press
- Officership in a professional organization
- Public talk related to teaching or research to a non-academic audience

•*Excellent*: For associate, full, and distinguished professors and associate and full teaching professors, this involves performing service beyond the department requiring a substantial time commitment, as well as good departmental citizenship. Substantial time commitment is defined as fulfilling at least two roles from list A *and* three or more roles from list B (or their equivalent), or some other major achievement in service explained by the self-evaluation. For assistant professors and assistant teaching professors, this involves performing service that fulfills at least one role beyond the department from list A *and* one or more roles from list B (or equivalent), as well as good departmental citizenship), or some other major achievement in service explained by the self-evaluation. For faculty at any rank to earn this rating, their self-evaluation should also explain the importance of said service to the department, university, community, or profession, as appropriate to the faculty member's rank, Allocation of Effort, and percent appointment.

•*Very good*: For associate, full, and distinguished professors and associate and full teaching professors, this involves performing service beyond the department requiring a moderate time commitment, as well as good departmental citizenship. Moderate time commitment is defined as fulfilling at least one role from list A *or* three or more roles from list B. For assistant professors and assistant teaching professors, this involves performing some service role beyond the department, as well as good departmental citizenship. For faculty at any rank to earn this rating, their self-evaluation must also explain the appropriateness of this level of service to the faculty member's rank, Allocation of Effort, and percent appointment.

•*Good*: For all faculty (including teaching professors), this involves good departmental citizenship, which requires fulfilling assigned service roles within the department and regular attendance at departmental and committee meetings. For associate, full, and distinguished professors and associate and full teaching professors, this also involves performing some service role beyond the department.

•*Marginal*: For all faculty (including teaching professors), this involves departmental citizenship that falls below expectations, such as partially fulfilling assigned service roles within the department, or irregular attendance at departmental and committee meetings. For associate, full, and distinguished professors and associate and full teaching professors, this also involves performing no service beyond the department.

•*Targeted for improvement*: For all faculty (including teaching professors), this involves repeated marginal performance in service over two years, including the year under review; or failure to fulfill assigned service roles within the department; or receiving an official sanction from a University tribunal or body that proscribed conduct in regard to service as outlined in the Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct. The failure to serve the department cannot be made up with service beyond the department.

D. Faculty Self-Evaluation Forms

The following pages provide forms for use in preparing self-evaluations in research, teaching, and service.

Annual Report Self-Evaluation Form: 1. Research

Year:

Name: Allocation of Effort: Percent appointment in History:

Please consult the Guidelines for Self-Evaluations and **highlight in bold** one and only one of the following rankings that you believe best represents your research performance for the calendar year:

Excellent Very Good Good Marginal Targeted for improvement

Please explain your choice using the remainder of this page and 12-point font.

Annual Report Self-Evaluation Form: 2. Teaching

Year:

Name: Allocation of Effort: Percent appointment in History:

Please consult the Guidelines for Self-Evaluations and **highlight in bold** one and only one of the following rankings that you believe best represents your teaching performance for the calendar year:

Excellent Very Good Good Marginal Targeted for improvement

Please explain your choice using the remainder of this page and 12-point font to answer the following: How have your courses and advising contributed to the overall good of the department and student learning? If you rate yourself very good or excellent, please address these issues as part of a more comprehensive self-evaluation of no more than two pages, plus supplemental materials.

Annual Report Self-Evaluation Form: 3. Service

Year:

Name: Allocation of Effort: Percent appointment in History:

Please consult the Guidelines for Self Evaluations and **highlight in bold** one and only one of the following rankings that you believe best represents your service performance for the calendar year:

Excellent Very Good Good Marginal Targeted for improvement

Please explain your choice using the remainder of this page and 12-point font.

E. Template of Curriculum Vitae for Faculty Evaluation

For Annual Faculty Evaluation, faculty members should prepare a Curriculum Vitae that adheres to the College format currently required for Progress Toward Tenure Review, Promotion and Tenure, and Post-tenure Review, as outlined here.

NAME Last Name, First Name MI

EDUCATION

Provide the following information on each baccalaureate and post-baccalaureate degree: Degree (B.A., B.S., M.A., Ph.D., etc.), Department/Discipline, Institution, Date Awarded

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY

Beginning with your current position, provide the following information on each position held since completing the terminal degree in your field: Title (Asst. Prof., Asst. Librarian, Asst. Scientist, Post Doctoral Researcher, etc.), Department and Institution, Start and End Dates. Include promotion dates as applicable.

KU TEACHING RECORD

A. List of Courses Taught

Please list all courses taught in the past calendar year and the number of students enrolled.

Course Number & Title	Sem/Year	# Enrolled
-----------------------	----------	------------

B. Undergraduate Advising Record

List the undergraduate students for whom you have served as the primary advisor or mentor, honors thesis chair, honors committee member, etc. over the past calendar year.

C. Graduate and Postgraduate Advising Record

Committee Chair: Doctoral. List the doctoral students whose committee you have chaired during past calendar year (give date of when they became ABD and the date of degree completion where appropriate):

Committee Chair: Masters. List the masters students whose committee you have chaired during the past calendar year (give date of when each began as your masters student and give date of degree completion where appropriate):

Other graduate committee service: List the names of other graduate students on whose examination or defense committees you have served during the past calendar year (give date of exam or defense). Group by type of degree (masters, doctoral).

Postdoctoral Fellows: *If applicable*, list the names and graduate institutions of postdoctoral fellows and visiting scholars whom you have mentored since the beginning of the past calendar year.

D. Honors and Awards for Teaching

List any awards received relating to teaching and/or advising that you have won during the past calendar year.

RESEARCH RECORD

A. Research Publications

Peer Reviewed Publications

- List in reverse chronological order (“in press” or most recent first) your peer-reviewed published and “in press” work. “In press” refers to work that is completed and accepted for publication with no substantial revisions pending.
- Include only work published within the four previous calendar years, inclusive of the review period.
- Give complete citations for all publications, including all authors/editors in the order in which they were listed, titles, year of publication, journal names and volume, page numbers for articles and book chapters, publishers for books and monographs, etc.
- Number the entries on the list.
- Identify which works were peer-reviewed/juried and which were invited. Include evidence of peer review in a separate file.
- For each multiple-authored work, indicate the principal author and the nature of your contributions to the work.

Non-Peer Reviewed Publications

- List in reverse chronological order (“in press” or most recent first) your non peer-reviewed work published and “in press” work or comparable creative work in artistic fields.
- Include only work published within the four previous calendar years, inclusive of the review period.
- Follow the guidelines above on citations, numbering, multiple-authored work, review process, and identification of work most relevant to this promotion.

Works Submitted or Ready for Submission.

- List work that has been submitted for publication over the past four years that has yet to be published with the date of submission
- Follow the guidelines above on citations, numbering, and multiple-authored work. Specify the status of the work (i.e., under review, ready for submission, accepted pending major revisions, book contract prospectus accepted, etc.).

B. Scholarly Presentations

- List in reverse chronological order (most recent first) your major scholarly presentations.
- Give complete citations for all presentations, including all authors in the order in which they were listed; the date and location of the presentation, the sponsoring organization (e.g., name of the professional organization or university), and venue (e.g., annual conference, visiting scholar seminar).
- Number all entries.
- For each multiple-authored presentation, indicate the principal author and the nature of your participation in the writing/research/presentation.

C. Grants and/or other Funded Projects

External Funding

1. Funded Proposals

- List in reverse chronological order (most recent first) all funded proposals for research over the past four years.
- For each, indicate the name of the project, your role (e.g., PI, Co-investigator, etc.) and the names of all co-investigators, the name of the funding agency/organization, the amount of funding requested/received, and dates of the project.
- Number all entries.
- Indicate whether the awards were the result of a refereed/competitive process or an invited sole source contract.

2. Proposals Under Review

- List in reverse chronological order (most recent first) all funding proposals that are currently under review.
- Follow the guidelines for funded proposals regarding the information on your role, awarding group, co-investigators, dates of proposed project, numbering, nature of review process, etc.

3. Other Proposals Submitted, Not Funded

- List in reverse chronological order (most recent first) all unfunded proposals that were submitted over the past four years.
- Follow the guidelines for funded proposals regarding the information on your role, awarding group, co-investigators, dates of proposed project, numbering, nature of review process, etc.

Internal Funding

- List in reverse chronological order (most recent first) all internal proposals for funding of research over the past four years.
- Follow the guidelines for external proposals regarding the information on your role, awarding group, co-investigators, disposition of the proposal, dates of award, numbering, nature of review process, etc.

D. Honors and Awards for Research

List in reverse chronological order (most recent first) honors and awards received for research/scholarly activity over the past four years.

SERVICE RECORD

A. University of Kansas Service

Within each of the categories, list service activities over the past calendar year. Please indicate any leadership roles and the date in which your service began and terminated if applicable.

- Assigned service duties within the Department of History
- Volunteer service duties within the Department of History
- Other departments
- College
- University

B. Professional Service outside the University

List any professional service activities you have performed over the last calendar year under the categories: Local and State, Regional, National, International. Include service as a journal editor or editorial board member, book reviewer, manuscript reviewer, external evaluator of promotion case or program, offices held in professional organizations, membership on grant review panels, etc. Do not include volunteer activities at any level that are unrelated to your professional expertise. Please indicate the date in which your service began and terminated if applicable.

C. Honors and Awards for Service

List awards received over the past year related to service.

Appendix E. Grievance Procedures

POLICY OWNER: DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

REVIEW, APPROVAL & CHANGE HISTORY:

Approved by vote of the faculty in the Department of History on April 17, 2019.

I. Overview

This policy applies to faculty and students in the Department of History within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Staff in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences follow the University Staff Grievance Procedure. It is to be followed when a grievant is unable to resolve a conflict through informal means of dispute resolution, such as direct or indirect consultation, compromise resolution, or mediation.

Pursuant to articles V and VI of University Senate Rules and Regulations (USRR) regarding Organization for Conflict Resolution, Unit Level Grievance Procedures (5.2), and Procedures for Conflict Resolution; article XII of the University Senate Code regarding Judicial Functions and Procedural Guarantees; and Article VII of the University Senate Rules and Regulations regarding Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, the Department of History establishes the following procedure to hear grievances arising within the Department of History. Appeal of a grievance heard at the unit level is to the University Judicial Board. The University Ombuds and Faculty Ombuds also exist to assist with conflict resolution. This procedure shall not be used to hear disputes assigned to other hearing bodies under USRR 6.2.

For disputes involving alleged academic misconduct, see the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences policy on academic misconduct. For alleged violations of student rights, such as grade appeals, the initial hearing normally will be at the unit level. There is an option to hold an initial hearing at the Judicial Board level if both parties agree, or if either party petitions the Judicial Board chair to have the hearing at the Judicial Board level and the petition is granted. The petition must state why a fair hearing cannot be obtained at the unit level; the opposing party has an opportunity to respond to the petition (USRR 6.4.3.1). Except as provided in USRR 6.5.4 regarding use of grievance process, no person shall be disciplined for using the grievance procedure or assisting another in using the grievance procedure.

The Department of History shall provide a copy of this procedure to anyone who requests it.

II. Grievance Procedures

1. *Time limits.* To make use of this unit-level procedure, the Complainant must file the written complaint with the Department of History within six months from the action or event that forms the basis of the complaint. The six-month time period shall be calculated using calendar days (including weekends and days during which classes are not in session).

2. Initial steps for the Complainant to follow:
 - a. To start the grievance process, the complainant must read thoroughly these Grievance Procedures and relevant provisions of the University Senate Code, University Senate Rules and Regulations, and applicable University policies.
 - b. The complainant should consider mediation or other informal resolution of the dispute.
 - c. The complainant should then submit a written grievance to the Department Chair, who will forward it to the chair of the Governance Committee. The chair of the Governance Committee will typically handle subsequent communications on behalf of the Department of History.
 - d. The complaint shall contain a statement of the facts underlying the complaint and specify the provision(s) of the Faculty Code of Conduct, University Senate Code, the University Senate Rules and Regulations, the Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities, or other applicable rule, policy, regulation, or law allegedly violated.
 - e. The complaint shall also indicate the witnesses or other evidence relied on by the complaining party, and copies of any documents relevant to the complaint shall be attached to the complaint.
3. The complaint shall identify the Respondent(s) within the unit level jurisdiction of the Department of History, and at the time the complaint is submitted to the Department of History, the complaining party shall also provide a copy of the complaint, with accompanying documents, to the responding party.
4. Upon receipt of the complaint, the Department of History shall contact the Respondent(s) to verify that they have received a copy of the complaint and to provide them with a copy of these Grievance Procedures.
5. Pursuant to procedural guarantees under article XII, section 2 of the University Senate Code, a Respondent has the privilege of remaining silent and refusing to give evidence in response to a complaint. The Respondent also has the right to respond and give evidence in response to the complaint. Both parties may self represent or choose to be represented by an advisor or counsel.
6. The Respondent shall submit a written response to the Department of History within 14 calendar days of receiving the complaint. The response shall contain the Respondent's statement of the facts underlying the dispute as well as any other defenses to the allegations in the complaint. The response shall also indicate the witnesses or other evidence relied on by the responding party, and copies of any documents relevant to the response shall be attached to the response. The responding party shall provide a complete copy of the response to the complaining party.
7. Upon receipt of the response, the Department of History shall contact the complaining party to verify that a copy of the response has been provided.

8. Upon receiving the complaint and response, or if the Respondent fails to respond within the 14-day time period, the Governance Committee [hereafter “the Committee”] shall consider the complaint, with the chair of the Committee acting as chair of the proceedings. The Committee members shall be disinterested parties who have not had previous involvement in the specific situation forming the basis of the complaint.
9. Pursuant to USRR 6.8.4.2 regarding Sharing of Information Concerning Multiple or Successive Grievances, the Committee chair may contact other hearing bodies within the University to determine whether a grievance or complaint involving the underlying occurrence or events is currently pending before or has been decided by any other hearing body.
10. Upon receiving the complaint, if the Committee chair determines that any of the following grounds exist, they may recommend to the Department Chair that the complaint be dismissed without further proceedings. The grounds for such dismissal are:
 - a. the grievance or another grievance involving substantially the same underlying occurrence or events has already been, or is being, adjudicated elsewhere by proper University procedures;
 - b. the grievance has not been filed in a timely fashion;
 - c. the Department Chair and Department of History lack jurisdiction over the subject matter or any of the parties;
 - d. the grievance fails to allege a violation of a University rule;
 - e. the party filing the grievance lacks standing because he or she has not suffered a distinct injury as a result of the challenged conduct and has not been empowered to bring the complaint on behalf of the University;
 - f. the party filing the grievance has been denied the right to file grievances pursuant to USRR 6.5.4 regarding Abuse of Grievance Process.
11. If the Committee chair determines that a grievance on its face properly should be heard by another body, the chair will recommend that the Department Chair send the grievance to the appropriate hearing body without further proceedings at the departmental level. The Department Chair will send a copy of the referral to the complainant(s) and any responding parties.
12. Prior to scheduling a hearing, the parties shall participate in mediation of the dispute unless either party waives mediation. Mediation shall be governed by USRR 6.2.3.
13. If mediation is successful, the mediator will forward to the Department Chair, the Committee chair, and all parties a letter describing the outcome of the mediation and the terms upon which the parties have agreed to resolve the dispute. This letter shall be a recommendation to the Department Chair. The Department Chair will notify the mediator, the committee chair, and the parties that the recommendation has been accepted, modified, or rejected.
14. If mediation is not successful, the mediator will notify the Department Chair, the Committee chair, and the parties that mediation has terminated. If mediation is not

successful, or if it is waived by either party, the grievance Committee will schedule a hearing no later than 30 calendar days from the written submission of the complaint. The 30-day period may be extended for good cause as determined by the Committee chair. The 30-day period shall be suspended during the mediation process. The hearing will be closed unless all parties agree that it shall be public.

15. Each party may represent themselves or be represented by an advisor or counsel of their choice.
16. Each party has the right to introduce all relevant testimony and documents if the documents have been provided with the complaint or response.
17. Each party shall be entitled to question the other party's witnesses. The Committee may question all witnesses.
18. Witnesses other than the parties shall leave the hearing room when they are not testifying.
19. The Committee chair shall have the right to place reasonable time limits on each party's presentation.
20. The Committee chair shall have the authority and responsibility to keep order, rule on questions of evidence and relevance, and shall possess other reasonable powers necessary for a fair and orderly hearing.
21. The hearing shall not be governed by the rules of evidence, but the Committee chair may exclude information he or she deems irrelevant, unnecessary, or duplicative. Statements or admissions made as part of the mediation process are not admissible.
22. The Committee will make an audiotape or videotape [hereafter "tape"] of the hearing but not of the deliberations of the Committee. The tape will be made available to the parties, their authorized representatives, the Committee, and the Department Chair. If a party desires a copy of the tape or a transcript of the tape, that party will pay for the cost of such copy or transcript. In the event of an appeal, the tape will be provided to the appellate body as part of the record of the case.
23. After the presentation of evidence and arguments, the Committee will excuse the parties and deliberate. The Committee's decision will be a written recommendation to the Department Chair. The Committee shall base its recommendations solely upon the information presented at the hearing.
24. The Committee will send its written recommendation to the Department Chair and the parties as soon as possible and no later than 14 calendar days after the end of the hearing.
25. Within 14 calendar days of receiving the Committee recommendation, the Department Chair will notify the parties of the acceptance, modification, or rejection of the

recommendation. The Department Chair will also advise the parties of the procedure available to appeal the decision.

26. The Department of History will retain a file of all materials relevant to the grievance for a period of five years, after which it will be destroyed.

Appendix F. Promotion Criteria for Teaching Professors

POLICY OWNER: DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

REVIEW, APPROVAL & CHANGE HISTORY:

Approved by vote of the faculty in the Department of History on April 17, 2019.

I. Promotion Standards for Teaching Professors

A. General Principles

The University strives for a consistent standard of quality against which the performance of all faculty members is measured. Nonetheless, the nature of faculty activities varies across the University and a faculty member's record must be evaluated in light of their particular responsibilities and the expectations of the discipline. The following criteria state the department's expectations of performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service for teaching professors necessary to satisfy the University standards for promotion to associate teaching professor and for promotion to full teaching professor.

The particular weight to be accorded to each component of a teaching professor's activities depends upon their contractual responsibilities and allocation of effort. While the contractual obligations for teaching professors sometimes vary, whenever possible, the efforts of teaching professors shall be categorized in terms of teaching, research, or service.

B. Teaching

Teaching is a primary function of the University, which strives to provide an outstanding education for its students. The evaluation of teaching includes consideration of syllabi, course materials, and other information related to a faculty member's courses; peer and student evaluations; a candidate's own statement of teaching philosophy and goals; public representations of teaching; and other accepted methods of evaluation. High quality teaching is serious intellectual work grounded in a deep knowledge and understanding of the field and includes the ability to convey that understanding in clear and engaging ways. The conduct of classes is the central feature of teaching responsibilities at KU, but teaching also includes supervising student research, mentoring and advising students, and other teaching-related activities outside of the classroom.

Under University standards for promotion to associate teaching professor, the record must demonstrate effective teaching, as reflected in such factors as command of the subject matter, the ability to communicate effectively in the classroom, a demonstrated commitment to student learning, and involvement in providing advice and support for students outside the classroom.

In the Department of History the following teaching expectations to meet University standards apply for promotion to the rank of *associate teaching professor*:

1. Candidates should document effective teaching of two or three courses per semester, as defined by their contract of appointment and the teaching needs of the department, with exceptions for approved leaves or reduced teaching loads, on all levels at which they teach. The record must demonstrate that a candidate's teaching reflects knowledge of their field, and that the candidate is effective in encouraging students' interests, helping them to think critically and to apply their knowledge, pointing them toward broader implications of their study.
2. Candidates should provide written student evaluations according to the latest University regulations.
3. Candidates should make their teaching available for peer evaluation. This evaluation may be based on a combination of types of evidence: study of syllabi, examinations, and assignments; classroom observation; reports of guest lecturing and/or team teaching; consultation with the candidates; assessments of advising, new courses developed, teaching awards, and other evidence supplied by the candidates; and public representations of teaching. Evaluations of teaching may be authored by faculty and staff from outside the Department of History. Because of the central importance of teaching to the overall activities of a teaching professor, such peer evaluations should be completed with frequency, and will preferably be made by faculty already engaged with faculty evaluation and/or by highly experienced members of the department well known for the efficacy of their teaching.
4. Candidates are expected to mentor undergraduate and graduate students.
5. Recommendation for promotion and tenure requires a positive assessment by the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the overall quality and quantity of a faculty member's teaching and advising.

Under University standards for promotion to the rank of *full teaching professor*, the record must demonstrate continued effectiveness and growth as a teacher, as reflected in such factors as mastery of the subject matter, strong classroom teaching skills, an ongoing commitment to student learning, and active involvement in providing advice and support for students outside the classroom.

In the Department of History, the following teaching expectations to meet University standards apply for promotion to the rank of full teaching professor:

1. Candidates should demonstrate continued effective teaching of two or three courses per semester, as defined by their contract of appointment, with exceptions for approved leaves or reduced teaching loads, effectiveness on all levels at which they teach. The record must demonstrate that a candidate's teaching reflects knowledge of their field, helping them to think critically and to apply their knowledge, pointing them toward broader implications of their study.

2. Candidates must provide written student evaluations since promotion to associate teaching professor, according to the latest University regulations.
3. Candidates should make their teaching available for peer evaluation since promotion to associate teaching professor. This evaluation may be based upon a combination of evidence: review of new courses taught and/or developed; study of syllabi, examinations, assignments; classroom observations; reports of guest lecturing and/or team teaching; assessments of advising, teaching awards, consultations with the candidates, and other information provided by the candidates; and public representations of teaching. Evaluations of teaching may be authored by faculty and staff from outside the Department of History. Because of the central importance of teaching to the overall activities of a teaching professor, such peer evaluations should be completed with frequency, and will preferably be made by faculty already engaged with faculty evaluation and/or by highly experienced members of the department well known for the efficacy of their teaching.
4. Candidates are expected to mentor undergraduate and graduate students.
5. Candidates have demonstrated growth as a teacher since their promotion to associate teaching professor.
6. Recommendation for promotion and tenure requires a positive assessment by the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the overall quality and quantity of a faculty member's teaching and advising.

C. Scholarship

The concept of "scholarship" encompasses not only traditional academic research and publication, but also the creation of artistic works or performances and any other products or activities accepted by the academic discipline as reflecting scholarly effort and achievement for purposes of promotion. While the nature of scholarship varies among disciplines, the University adheres to a consistently high standard of quality in its scholarly activities to which all faculty members, regardless of discipline, are held. For teaching professors, publications relating to pedagogy are considered scholarship.

Under University standards for promotion to the rank of associate teaching professor, the record must demonstrate a successfully developing scholarly career, as reflected in such factors as the quality and quantity of publications or creative activities, unpublished or published reviews of the candidate's work, the candidate's regional, national, or international reputation, and other evidence of an active and productive scholarly agenda.

In the Department of History, the following scholarship expectations to meet University standards apply for the promotion to the rank of *associate teaching professor*:

1. Candidates should have in print or formally accepted and scheduled for publication (a) at least two substantial articles either in respected, peer-reviewed or refereed research

journals or in respected publications relating to pedagogy, or (b) refereed critical editions, collected volumes, journal issues, compilations, translations, electronic publications, and public exhibits equivalent in scholarly significance to (a). Alternatively, candidates may have in print or formally accepted and scheduled for publication a book-length peer-reviewed or refereed study with a respected press relating to research or pedagogy.

2. Candidates should provide information concerning the refereeing or review process for their scholarship relating to research or pedagogy.
3. Candidates should demonstrate a sustainable program of scholarly activity and successful development in their careers as scholars appropriate to their allocation of effort for research.
4. Recommendation for promotion and tenure requires a positive assessment by the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the overall quality and quantity of a faculty member's scholarship on research and pedagogy.

In the Department of History, the following scholarship expectations to meet University standards also apply for the promotion to the rank of *full teaching professor*:

1. In addition to work published or formally accepted and scheduled for publication at the time of their promotion to associate professor, candidates should have in print or formally accepted and scheduled for publication (a) at least two articles either in respected, peer-reviewed or refereed research journals or in respected publications relating to pedagogy, or (b) refereed critical editions, collected volumes, journal issues, compilations, translations, electronic publications, and public exhibits equivalent in scholarly significance to (a). Alternatively, candidates may have in print or formally accepted and scheduled for publication a book-length peer-reviewed study with a respected press relating to research or pedagogy.
2. Candidates should provide information concerning the refereeing or review process for their scholarship relating to research or pedagogy.
3. Candidates should demonstrate a sustainable program of scholarly activity and successful development in their careers as scholars appropriate to their allocation of effort for research.
4. Candidates should provide copies of evaluations (reviews, citations, reports by other scholars, etc.) of scholarship published, accepted for publication, or exhibited since the time of promotion to associate teaching professor.
5. Candidates should demonstrate national and/or international recognition as scholars and/or teachers.

6. Recommendation for promotion and tenure requires a positive assessment by the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the overall quality and quantity of a faculty member's scholarship on research and pedagogy.

D. Service

Service is an important responsibility of all faculty members that contributes to the University's performance of its larger mission. Although the nature of service activities will depend on a candidate's particular interests and abilities, service contributions are an essential part of being a good citizen of the University. The Department of History accepts and values scholarly service to the discipline or profession, service within the University, and public service at the local, state, national, or international level.

Under the University standards for promotion to associate teaching professor, the record must at least demonstrate a pattern of service to the department and the University. Service to the discipline or profession, and/or to the local, state, national, or international communities is also desirable.

In the Department of History, the following service expectations to meet University standards apply for the promotion to the rank of associate teaching professor:

1. Candidates are expected to engage in service chiefly at the departmental level, though service to other units, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, the University, faculty governance, the historical profession, and the broader community will be recognized. It is expected that for most teaching professors, part of this service will be closely related to their teaching.
2. Service will be evaluated with respect to quality as well as to quantity and with regard to the candidate's contractual allocation of effort. For promotion to associate teaching professor, this means fulfilling assigned service roles on the department's regular committees each year in which the candidate is not on leave, regular attendance and participation in departmental and committee meetings; and for teaching professors with at least a ten percent allocation of effort to service, fulfilling at least two professional service roles outside the department. This can include but is not limited to service elsewhere in the University, to reviewing books or manuscripts, organizing conference panels, giving public talks to non-academic audiences, serving as an officer in a professional organization, or serving as a member of an editorial board.

Under University standards for promotion to the rank of full teaching professor, the record must demonstrate an ongoing pattern of service reflecting substantial contributions to the department and the University at one or more levels, to the discipline or profession, and/or to the local, state, national, or international communities.

In the Department of History, the following service expectations to meet University standards apply for the promotion to the rank of *full teaching professor*:

1. Candidates are expected to engage in service at the following levels: the department, the College or University, and public or professional. It is expected that for most teaching professors, part of this service will be closely related to their teaching.
2. Service will be evaluated with respect to quality as well as to quantity and with regard to the candidate's contractual allocation of effort. For promotion to full teaching professor, this means meeting all expectations of service for those seeking promotion to associate teaching professor, plus the following: regular and engaged participation in service roles beyond the department but within KU; and an ongoing pattern of professional service roles including but not limited to reviewing books or manuscripts, organizing conference panels, giving public talks to non-academic audiences, serving as an officer in a professional organization, and serving as a member of an editorial board.

E. *Ratings for Performance.* Using the criteria described above, the candidate's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service will be rated using the terms "excellent," "very good," "good," "marginal," or "poor," defined as follows:

- (a) "Excellent" means that the candidate substantially exceeds expectations for promotion to this rank.
- (b) "Very Good" means the candidate exceeds expectations for promotion to this rank.
- (c) "Good" means the candidate meets expectations for promotion to this rank.
- (d) "Marginal" means the candidate falls below expectations for promotion to this rank.
- (e) "Poor" means the candidate falls significantly below expectations for promotion to this rank.

Absent exceptional circumstances, no candidate may be recommended for promotion without meeting standards in all applicable areas of performance, and strong candidates are likely to exceed expectations in one or more categories.

II. Promotion Procedures for Teaching Professors

At this time, the College and University have not developed elaborate formal policies for promoting teaching professors. This section will be more fully developed after the promulgation of these official policies. In the meantime, we expect promotion procedures for teaching professors to be similar to, but less elaborate than those for tenure-stream faculty. Promotion procedures will have the following basic steps:

A. Promotion and Tenure Committee

Department-level recommendations for promotion of teaching professors will be made by the same Promotion and Tenure Committee charged with making recommendations for tenure-

stream associate and full professors, plus any teaching professors at or above the rank to which the candidate aspires to be promoted (see appendix).

B. Initiation of Review and Preparation of the Promotion File

At an appropriate time in keeping with College and University Policy, teaching professors with at least six years of experience at their current rank should inform the Department Chair that they will initiate procedures for promotion at the next available opportunity. It is the responsibility of the candidate to complete all appropriate forms and provide all necessary documents and information in accordance with University policy on the promotion of teaching professors, and with the assistance of the department's administrative associates, to make these materials available to the department for thorough review.

C. Certification Committees

The Department Chair will appoint a Certification Committee consisting of three tenure-stream faculty or teaching professors of the department at or above the rank to which the candidate aspires to be promoted. The Certification Committee will first complete a preliminary review of the candidate's record of teaching, scholarship, and service and determine if it meets the requirements for certification and will inform the Department Chair in writing of its decision. If the candidate meets or exceeds the minimum requirements for promotion in all three areas of teaching, scholarship and service, the Certification Committee will write a more detailed report summarizing the candidate's record of teaching, scholarship, and service for use by the Promotion and Tenure Committee. This report must be provided at least two weeks prior to the meeting.

D. Departmental-Level Review and Recommendation

The Department Chair will arrange a convenient time for a meeting of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, well in advance of the deadlines for submission of nominations to the College, with separate meetings for consideration of the promotion of assistant and associate teaching professors, typically done in parallel with consideration of tenure-stream faculty.

The first order of business for each candidate will be to accept the written report of the candidate's Certification Committee. Amendments may be offered by motion and approved by majority vote. Once accepted, this report shall serve as the basis for the Promotion and Tenure Committee's summary evaluation to be included in the candidate's dossier when it is sent to the College. After discussion, secret ballots will be cast to determine ratings for each area of performance and to recommend the candidate for promotion. Votes can only be cast by members who have attended the discussions of the Promotion and Tenure Committee relative to each candidate and who have studied the dossier of the candidate. Those members otherwise unable to attend may submit signed letters in regard to individual candidacies that may be read or distributed to members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, but cannot vote.

The overall rating of performance by the Promotion and Tenure Committee in teaching, scholarship, and service will be the average of the ratings submitted by voters for each respective

category, rounded to the nearest whole number. The majority of votes will determine the Promotion and Tenure Committee's overall recommendations for or against promotion.

Following the Promotion and Tenure Committee meetings, for each candidate, the Certification Committee shall prepare the Promotion and Tenure Committee's recommendation, ratings of performance, and summary evaluation sections on the appropriate forms and forward these to the Department Chair. The Department Chair shall indicate separately, in writing, whether they concur or disagree with the recommendations of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Department Chair shall then communicate in writing these recommendations and their own concurrence or disagreement with these recommendations to the candidate. If the Promotion and Tenure Committee's recommendation is negative, the review will not be forwarded automatically to the College. In that case, the Department Chair will inform the candidate that they have the right to halt or proceed with forwarding the dossier to the College for further review.