

BYLAWS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

April 2016

I. STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES INVOLVING DEPARTMENT GOVERNANCE

By adoption and periodic review of these Bylaws, the faculty evidences its commitment to full participation in the academic governance of the Department. The faculty seeks, through the exercise of the decision-making responsibilities recognized herein, to organize its resources as a community of scholars to help conduct the affairs of the Department of History not only in its own best interests but in the best interests of the larger academic community of which it is an integral part.

A. Department Head

The Department Head is a member of the faculty who has been given certain administrative responsibilities and the authority to carry out those responsibilities. In meeting his or her duties, the Head will work with the faculty and be sensitive to the advice of the faculty. Should it become necessary for the Head to act contrary to the advice of the faculty, he or she will explain to the faculty why the action was taken.

The faculty plays an important role in the selection, evaluation, and reappointment of the Department Head. In these matters the Department will be governed by the procedures set forth in the Faculty Handbook, Chapter 1.4.4 through 1.4.6.

B. Associate Head

The Associate Head is appointed by the Head with the approval of the Dean of the College and will be an ex-officio member of the Head's Advisory Committee and the Undergraduate Committee. He or she will perform such administrative duties as are assigned by the Head and will, in the Head's absence, represent the Head on departmental committees normally chaired by the Head or those on which the Head serves.

The faculty is furthermore committed to an active mentoring process. Mentoring is intended to help junior faculty members adjust to their new environment by receiving guidance from more experienced colleagues on such issues as academic and career development. Mentoring effectively will help the Department to foster excellence in scholarship and teaching and to create a respectful, positive work environment.

II. PROCEDURES FOR DEPARTMENT BUSINESS

A. Faculty

The voting faculty of the Department of History will consist of all full-time tenured or tenure-track personnel. Voting privileges will extend to all such members of the faculty unless otherwise restricted in these Bylaws or in the Faculty Handbook. Proxy voting will be permitted.

B. Faculty Meetings

1. In order to facilitate the candid exchange of views, faculty meetings will be restricted to members of the History faculty and an appropriate staff member, provided, however, that by majority vote a meeting or portion thereof may be opened or specific individuals may be invited to attend.
2. Faculty meetings will be called by the Head as the need exists or upon request of the Advisory Committee or upon request of one-fifth of the History faculty.
3. An agenda will be prepared by the Head with the assistance of the Advisory Committee; items may be added by the action of one-fifth of the faculty. The agenda will be distributed to the faculty at least four working days before the meeting. Final faculty action may not be taken on an item which is not on the distributed agenda.
4. Meetings will be held at least twice each semester, on a weekday, while the University is in session, summer sessions excluded.
5. Except where otherwise specified, decisions will be made by a majority of the faculty voting.
6. A quorum consists of a majority of the faculty who are not on leave, unless otherwise specified in these Bylaws.
7. Except where in conflict with these Bylaws, Robert's Rules of Order will govern faculty meetings.
8. Except as outlined below, minutes of faculty meetings will be taken and distributed to the faculty and a copy will be available in the Department office.

C. Extraordinary Faculty Meetings

1. An extraordinary faculty meeting is one which is called for a weekend, a time when the University is not in session, the summer session, or when the agenda has not been distributed four working days before the meeting time.
2. Extraordinary faculty meetings will be called by the Head as the need exists or upon request of the Advisory Committee or upon request of one-fifth of the History faculty.

3. At such meetings there must be a quorum and all decisions must be by a majority vote of the entire faculty in attendance.

D. Faculty Meetings Concerning Appointment, Renewal of Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion

1. Eligibility for participation in these meetings is specified in the Faculty Handbook and the Manual for Faculty Evaluation.
2. Notice of a meeting with the agenda and all pertinent materials such as vitae, committee recommendations, etc., must be presented to the eligible faculty at least five working days prior to the meeting. A quorum will consist of two-thirds of the eligible faculty not on leave. Eligible faculty who are on leave have the right to attend or to cast their ballots in absentia.
3. Because on these matters, the Head is expected to be guided by the wishes of the faculty and to explain faculty opinion to the Dean, each eligible faculty member should express his or her assessment of the person under consideration. All votes, however, will be by secret ballot and the results communicated to the eligible faculty.
4. Proxy ballots or statements of sentiment regarding an issue may be presented before or during the meeting, or a faculty member may designate a colleague as his or her proxy. However, no such proxy action will be permitted after the meeting. In making his or her recommendation to the Dean, the Head will include the vote of the faculty, specifying the number in favor, opposed, abstaining, and not casting ballots.
5. These meetings will be strictly confidential and no minutes will be taken.

III. HEAD'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE

A. Composition

1. The Advisory Committee will consist of three members, one from each professorial rank (i.e., assistant, associate, full) to be elected, by the faculty; and two members of any rank, to be appointed by the Head. The two appointed members must not be of the same rank. The Head is the chair of the Committee and the Associate Head serves as an ex-officio member.
2. Elected members will be chosen by the following process: Each member of the tenure-stream faculty will nominate one member in his/her rank by written nominations submitted to the Head, who will compile a ballot consisting of the two names for each rank which have received the most nominations. The election is at large and will be by secret ballot. Written announcement of the composition of the Committee will be made prior to August 1 of each academic year. Elected and appointed members will serve one-year terms, with a limit of three consecutive terms.

B. Responsibilities

1. To advise the Head on the composition (members and chair) of all departmental standing committees and on the appointment of the Department's Library Representative.
2. To assist the Head in preparing for the faculty meetings
3. To advise and counsel the Head on planning and program development of the Department and departmental budget priorities.
4. To consider problems that relate to faculty morale, communication of information within the Department, student-faculty relations, and other matters of concern to the Department, and to advise the Head accordingly.
5. To advise the Head on any matter he/she wishes to bring before it.
6. To meet at the call of the Head or three members of the Committee.

IV. UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM

The Associate Head serves as director of the undergraduate program.

A. Composition of the Undergraduate Committee

The Undergraduate Committee will consist of:

1. At least three faculty members, representing, if possible, each of the three major areas of instruction offered by the Department, viz., U.S. history, European history, and World history.
2. The Honors Coordinator and the Associate Head as ex-officio members.

B. Responsibilities

In collaboration with the Department Head, the Associate Head sets the agenda for the Undergraduate Committee meetings in consultation with the Undergraduate Committee chair.

Appropriate tasks for the committee may include:

1. To consider undergraduate course proposals and make appropriate recommendations to the Department.
2. To identify goals, specify objectives, and recommend appropriate changes in the undergraduate program.
3. To review undergraduate offerings with respect to such matters as relevancy to the general undergraduate program, enrollment, frequency and regularity of offering, credit hour allocation, and course numbering, and to report its findings to the Head or where appropriate to the Department.
4. To evaluate lecturers annually, as assigned by the Head or Associate Head.

5. To develop plans and programs for the improvement of undergraduate instruction.
6. To administer undergraduate awards, as follows:
 - a) At the beginning of spring semester the Associate Head will obtain from the Student Records Office certain information on History majors (credit hours, grade point averages, etc.) to use in conjunction with faculty input in preparing nominations for annual College and University academic awards.
 - b) Early in the spring semester the Associate Head will disseminate information and applications pertaining to departmental scholarships; the committee will select the winners at least two weeks before the Honors Banquet in April.
 - c) In consultation with the Honors Coordinator, the committee will select the winner of the outstanding Honors paper at least two weeks before the Honors Banquet in April.
 - d) In consultation with faculty, the committee will select the outstanding graduating senior in History during the current academic year.
7. To keep the faculty informed of its activities.

V. GRADUATE COMMITTEE

The Director of Graduate Studies serves as director of the graduate program.

A. Composition of the Graduate Committee

The Graduate Committee will consist of:

1. Five faculty members, representing each of the three major areas of instruction offered by the Department, viz., U.S. history, European history, and Asian/African/Latin American history.
2. The Director of Graduate Studies (DGS), who serves ex-officio.

B. Responsibilities

In collaboration with the Department Head, the DGS sets the agenda for the graduate committee in consultation with the graduate committee chair.

Appropriate Programmatic tasks for the committee may include:

1. to review graduate course proposals and make appropriate recommendations to the Department;
2. to identify goals, specify objectives, and recommend appropriate changes in the graduate program;

3. to review the graduate program with respect to such matters as the language and research tool requirements, the fields of concentration, the nature of the written and oral examinations, and graduate offerings, and to make appropriate recommendations to the Department; and
4. to receive requests and petitions from graduate students for approval of special study proposals and for waivers and/or modifications of departmental graduate program requirements, and to take final action on such requests in all cases that do not involve change in basic departmental policy.

Appropriate Awards and Review tasks for the committee may include:

1. to review all applications for graduate teaching and research positions and to recommend appointments to such positions, along with alternates;
2. to render advice and counsel to the Department Head and/or DGS with respect to filling assistantship vacancies and to appointing graduate students or others to teaching positions within the Department and the University;
3. to review procedures and criteria for awarding and renewing graduate and teaching assistantships; and
4. to make awards each semester for graduate research.

VI. CAUCUS COMMITTEES

Each faculty member will participate as a voting member of a caucus, based on the field of research and teaching US, Modern Europe, Pre-modern Europe, World (Asia-Africa-Latin America-Middle East). As directed by the Head, each caucus will meet periodically, at least each semester, in order to facilitate course scheduling, admissions, funding and student award decisions, and to review curriculum and other caucus-specific matters. These meetings will be convened and led by the head of each caucus, a position assigned by the Department Head. Typically the caucus head will be the senior member from that caucus serving on the graduate committee that year.

Recommendations made by the caucus regarding course scheduling, graduate funding, and scholarship awards will be forwarded to the Associate Head and/or DGS for review and approval; recommendations about graduate funding and student awards will be forwarded to the Graduate Committee for review and approval.

VII. OTHER COMMITTEES

The following are service committees whose composition is either predetermined or chosen by the Head with the advice of the Advisory Committee:

A. Speaker Committee

The Committee makes speaker arrangements for the Department's annual lecture series, develops policies for the effective administration of all lectures coordinated by the History Department or its faculty, and advises faculty members and staff on this process as needed.

B. LeRoy P. Graf Award Committee

1. Each year the recipient will be chosen from the tenure-stream faculty by a committee consisting of the last three available recipients of the award.
2. The winner will be an accomplished teacher who has demonstrated particular excellence in research and publication.
3. Preference will be given to those who have not won the award within the last six years.

C. Publicity and Outreach Committee

Duties include preparing and distributing the annual newsletter, advising and assisting with the Department's website and electronic communication, and in other ways publicizing the Department and its activities.

VIII. AD HOC COMMITTEES

Ad hoc committees may be established by the Head, with the advice of the Advisory Committee or by majority vote of the faculty.

The appointment and role of search committees will be governed by the rules set forth in the Faculty Handbook, Chapter 3.1.3, and by further guidelines established by the Office of Equity and Diversity, and the dean's and provost's offices. The Department Head appoints the head and members of the search committee, in consultation with the advisory committee. It is the Department Head's responsibility to assure appropriate search committee representation in accordance with University search procedures. The search committee recommends the applicant pool and identifies candidates to be considered for interviews. The Department then proceeds with the search in accordance with the Faculty Handbook, Chapter 3.1.3.

The appointment and role of search committees for the position of Department Head will be governed by the rules set forth in the Faculty Handbook, Chapter 1.4.4.

IX. NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

The appointment of non-tenure-track faculty (i.e., lecturers) will be governed by the rules set forth in the Faculty Handbook, Chapter 4.1 and 4.1.1. The Head and associate head, in consultation with relevant faculty members, will appoint lecturers. Candidates for lectureships normally will hold the Ph.D. or at least have completed all requirements for the Ph.D. except the dissertation. Appointment of lecturers will be based on departmental teaching needs and annual evaluation of each lecturer. Evidence on which the evaluation will be based includes sample syllabi and other course material provided by the lecturer, observation of one or more of the lecturer's classes by a tenure-stream faculty member, and student evaluations if available.

Length of service shall be as follows:

- A. Except in extraordinary circumstances, PhD graduates of the University of Tennessee History Department will be limited in their employment as lecturers to one year of service, and are not eligible for promotion to Senior or Distinguished Lectureships.
- B. Normally, visiting lecturers who hold degrees from institutions other than the University of Tennessee will be offered one-year contracts, renewable for one additional year, based on the lecturer's performance and the Department's budget and teaching needs.
- C. Exceptions to these guidelines may be made in cases of partner accommodation.

Promotion of non-tenure track faculty (i.e., lecturers) will be governed by the rules set forth in the Manual for Faculty Evaluation, Part VI and policies approved by the Department.

Promotion to Senior and Distinguished Lecturer will be by invitation from the Department, approved by faculty vote, and will be offered only in cases in which the candidate demonstrates an excellent teaching record in a field that serves the Department's teaching needs.

The Department's procedure for promotion of lecturers includes the following:

A. Nomination Procedure:

The Department Head in consultation with the Associate Head and the Undergraduate Committee nominates candidate(s) for promotion to senior or distinguished lecturer based on the quality of their teaching, the degree of their involvement in departmental culture and the profession as a whole, and the instructional needs of the Department. Lecturers may not nominate themselves. Nomination for promotion to senior or distinguished lecturer is not automatic upon the completion of the required years of service at the University of Tennessee.

B. Review Process:

A three-member faculty committee, appointed by the Department Head, reviews the dossier and makes a recommendation to the Department, which must support the promotion by a majority vote before it is forwarded to the College.

C. Criteria for Promotion to Senior and Distinguished Lectureships:

1. Quality of teaching will be determined by:
 - a) Copies of annual peer evaluations;
 - b) Quality of syllabi and other course materials (clarity, explanation of outcomes, creative approach, assignments, amount of detail...);
 - c) SAIS scores; and
 - d) Statement of teaching philosophy
2. Participation in departmental culture and the profession as a whole may be indicated by service on committees (where allowed); presence in the Department and participation in departmental events (including community outreach); degree of interaction with regular faculty (e. g., participation in faculty-graduate student research seminars or scholarly collaboration); ability and willingness to engage in and follow administrative processes regarding plagiarism, counseling, and reporting of particular problems.
3. Participation in the profession may be indicated by on-going research in the discipline or in the scholarship of teaching as evidenced by conference presentations and publication; involvement in regional and national scholarly organizations; attendance at teaching workshops, and other professional development opportunities.

X. RESPONSIBILITIES AND WORKLOAD OF TENURED AND TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

Faculty members are engaged in ongoing research agendas with clear goals. They publish peer-reviewed articles and books, make professional presentations, and engage in other creative scholarly activities. They also, where appropriate, work toward acquiring external funding.

Normally the annual teaching load is four courses, although the Head can assign other teaching loads in a variety of circumstances (see Faculty Handbook Chapter 3.7). Besides teaching courses, faculty members oversee undergraduate and graduate research including theses and dissertations.

Faculty members, and particularly tenured faculty members, participate in departmental governance and committees, College and University committees and task forces, community outreach activities, service to the profession, and student advising. Normally, first-year assistant professors are not assigned committee work.

All statements about workload and responsibilities are understood within the context of a three-year rolling average.

Workload and responsibilities are governed by the rules set forth in the Faculty Handbook, Chapters 2.2 and 3.7.

XI. APPOINTMENT AND ROLE OF THE FACULTY MENTOR

The faculty is committed to an active mentoring process. Mentoring is intended to provide junior faculty members with support and guidance from more experienced colleagues on teaching, research, and other aspects of career development. Effective mentoring helps the Department to foster excellence in scholarship and teaching and to create a respectful, positive work environment.

A. In accordance with the procedures outlined in the Manual for Faculty Evaluation, Part I.A.3, the Head should assign every newly hired tenure-track faculty member a mentor. The mentor, a tenured faculty member in the Department, should be chosen by the Head in consultation with the new tenure-track faculty member and the search committee involved in his or her hire.

B. In order to help the tenure-track faculty member adjust smoothly to teaching in the Department, a mentor should be assigned as soon as possible after a hiring commitment has been made. Mentors should serve as resource people and advisors to tenure-track faculty members, helping them further develop their teaching skills and continue to progress with their research.

- C. The mentor will serve in a formal capacity as an advisor to the tenure-track faculty member through his or her probationary period, and will represent the faculty member during the annual retention review. Changes in the mentor can be made at any time in consultation with the Department Head. The tenure-track faculty member is also encouraged to seek out advice from additional tenured faculty members.

XII. ANNUAL RETENTION REVIEW OF TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

- A. In accordance with the timetable and guidelines for annual evaluations as established by the provost's office, (Faculty Handbook, Chapter 3.11.3.4 and Manual for Faculty Evaluation, Part I.B.1)
- B. Each tenure-track member of the faculty will provide the tenured faculty with a written summary of his or her research, teaching, and service over the past year. As a supplement to the yearly report prepared by the tenure-track faculty member, the Head will make each probationary faculty member's teaching evaluations, both student and peer, available to the senior faculty. Senior faculty may also request additional information or conduct visits to the tenure-track faculty member's classes, as deemed necessary.
- C. In accordance with the annual evaluation timetable, the tenured faculty will meet to consider the retention of tenure-track faculty members. The Department Head will select a representative of the faculty eligible to serve as recorder of the discussion for each candidate. Tenured faculty are obligated to fully express their views on the tenure-track faculty at the meeting so that untenured faculty can receive proper guidance. Faculty must submit their vote on a written secret ballot, and are encouraged to include reasons for their decisions. The recorder will summarize the faculty discussion in writing and present that summary and the vote on retention to the Department Head and the tenure-track faculty member.
- D. After the tenured faculty meeting, the Department Head will conduct an independent retention review based upon the faculty member's written summary and other submitted materials, the written narrative and vote of the tenured faculty, and a scheduled meeting with the faculty member.
- E. The Department Head makes an independent recommendation on retention. The Department Head's report includes a written report offering express guidance to the Dean as to retention or non-retention, including an evaluation of performance using guidelines outlined in the Manual for Faculty Evaluation, I.B.1.e.

1. If a retention review results in a recommendation by the Department Head to retain the tenure-track faculty member, the Department Head will ensure that the written report includes express guidance to the faculty member on ways to improve performance as these seem justified.
 2. If the retention review results in a recommendation by the Department Head not to retain the tenure-track faculty member, the Department Head includes specific reasons for that decision in the report.
- F. Any member of the tenured faculty may submit a statement to the Department Head dissenting from the majority decision of the voting faculty. A copy of the dissenting statement will be furnished to the faculty member under review. The dissenting statement will be attached to the Retention Review Form.
- G. The tenure-track faculty member reviews the Retention Review Form and each attached narrative and report. The faculty member's digital signature indicates that she or he has read the entire evaluation, but the signature does not necessarily imply agreement with its findings.
- H. The faculty member under review has a right to submit a written response to the vote and narrative of the tenured faculty, to the report and recommendation of the Department Head, and/or to any dissenting statements. The faculty member will be allowed two weeks from the date of receipt of the finalized Retention Review Form and its complete set of attachments to submit any written response. If no response is received after two weeks of the date of receipt, the faculty member relinquishes the right to respond.
- I. The Department Head will forward to the Dean the finalized Retention Review Form, together with the Head's report and recommendation, the retention vote and the narrative of the tenured faculty, and all dissenting statements and responses.
- J. Fourth-Year Retention Review
1. In the fourth year of a tenure-track faculty member's tenure clock, the tenured faculty will conduct an extensive review of the tenure-track faculty member's progress. The review will be carried out by a three-person committee, composed of tenured faculty members. One member of this committee will be appointed at the request of the tenure-track faculty member under review; the other two will be appointed by the Department Head.

In the fall semester of the fourth year in the tenure clock, the tenure-track faculty member will provide the senior faculty the following materials in accordance with the provost's annual timetable for faculty evaluation:
 - a) a written summary describing past teaching, research, and service, as well as future research plans;

- b) copies of past course syllabi and teaching evaluations;
 - c) copies of all previous publications and of any manuscripts or articles submitted for publication;
 - d) a current curriculum vitae; and
 - e) other materials that the candidate deems supportive of retention
- The appointed fourth-year review committee will evaluate these materials, conduct visits to the tenure-track faculty's classes, and then submit a report to the senior faculty in time for the annual fall retention review meeting.

2. In the fifth year of the tenure clock, the probationary faculty member should work with the Head and the fourth-year review committee to address issues identified as potential or actual problems in the fourth-year review, while continuing to prepare for the tenure and promotion process in the sixth year.
3. The subsequent procedures for the fourth-year review will follow the guidelines laid out in the departmental Bylaws section on annual reviews (XIV).

XIII. TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION REVIEW

A. Definition of Tenure:

As defined by the Manual for Faculty Evaluation, tenure is a principle that entitles a faculty member to continuation of his or her annual appointment until relinquishment or forfeiture of tenure or until termination of tenure for adequate causes, financial exigency, or academic program discontinuance. Tenure is granted on the basis of a demonstrated record of achievement and the promise of continued excellence. Although reviews are conducted at the department, college, and university levels, tenure at the University of Tennessee is acquired only by positive action of the Board of Trustees. Procedures for tenure and promotion review are the same.

B. Timetables for Tenure and/or Promotion Review:

Generally, assistant professors will be considered for promotion to the rank of associate professor at the same time as they are considered for tenure. The date for the latter is set out in each probationary faculty member's appointment letter. Generally, associate professors must serve at least five years in rank before promotion to full professor.

C. Expectations for Tenure and/or Promotion:

The recommendation of tenure in the Department of History will be consistent with established policies of the University of Tennessee, as outlined in the Faculty Handbook and the Manual for Faculty Evaluation. The criteria below clarify those requirements and applies them to the specific needs of the historical discipline and the Department of History.

These departmental specifications are meant to clarify and strengthen University standards.

1. The essential qualification for tenure is the attainment of high standards in research and teaching.
2. Measured by professional standards, meritorious historical scholarship reflects the author's ability to:
 - a) identify a problem or topic, develop a research design with rigor, and apply the most appropriate historical methods;
 - b) locate and examine evidence fully, drawing intelligent inferences from it;
 - c) reach defensible conclusions; and
 - d) present the topic, findings, and conclusions in a written form that is well organized, articulate, clear and persuasive.
3. Tenure and promotion to associate professor requires the publication of a book-length monograph (electronic or print) judged by the tenured faculty to be of sufficient quality. Their judgment will be informed by external review letters which are obtained in accordance with the Manual for Faculty Evaluation, Part IV.B.4. The monograph must have undergone rigorous peer evaluation as part of the acceptance process before publication. Except under extraordinary circumstances, before the Department faculty meets to vote on tenure and promotion the monograph must also either already have been published in its final form or be at the stage of the process of production in which it is under contract and in page-proof form or its electronic equivalent.
4. Promotion to the rank of professor requires two or more monographs, or their generally recognized equivalent within the sub-discipline, judged by the full professors of the department to be of sufficient quality. Their judgment must be informed by external review letters which are obtained in accordance with the Manual for Faculty Evaluation, Part IV.B.4. Each of these monographs also must either already have been published in its final form or be at the stage of the process of production in which it is under contract and in page-proof form or its electronic equivalent.
5. Teaching performance is measured in a variety of ways, including consideration of the following: student evaluations, class visits by colleagues, and the review of syllabi and other teaching materials. These evaluations will consider evidence of the candidate's subject knowledge,

course organization, and classroom management and presentation skills. Candidates are also encouraged to submit evidence regarding the supervision of graduate and undergraduate theses, teaching awards, and grants and presentations related to teaching.

6. Candidates are expected to share in responsibilities related to departmental, college, and university governance and professional service, but such activities are considered concomitants to research and teaching, not substitutes for research and teaching.

D. Tenure and/or Promotion Materials:

A candidate for tenure and/or promotion review will prepare and submit a dossier, *curriculum vitae*, and supporting materials as evidence of his or her activities in teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service.

No later than April 1, persons required to undergo tenure review will provide the Head with the following material:

1. a curriculum vitae and an optional one-page "tenure statement" summarizing the candidate's career path, goals, accomplishments, and statement of responsibilities as outlined, in agreement with the Head, during the first six months of service;
2. names, addresses, and telephone numbers of references of at least three scholars from outside the University of Tennessee, at a higher rank than the candidate. These references should be persons competent to assess scholarly and/or pedagogical contributions of the candidate;
3. copies of all publications (including book reviews) and copies of all papers and commentaries read at professional meetings;
4. copies of syllabi, reading lists, and other instructional materials developed by the candidate; and
5. other evidence that, in the candidate's judgment or the Head's judgment, would serve to justify the granting of tenure.

A more detailed description of what should be included in the dossier can be found in the Manual for Faculty Evaluation, Appendix B.

In addition, the Department Head and tenure/promotion committee will add the following attachments to the materials submitted by the faculty member:

1. Letters from external evaluators who have conducted an assessment based on the curriculum vitae and supporting materials such as sample publications. Under the supervision of the Head, these letters will be solicited by the individual tenure/promotion committee. In total eight to ten letters must be solicited, all of them normally from scholars at the rank of professor. No more than half the letters in the file may be from the candidate's list of possible evaluators. The remainder of the letters must

- come from a list compiled by unanimous agreement of the tenure/promotion committee;
2. Previous evaluative reports such as the Retention Review Forms and Faculty Annual Evaluation Reports; and
 3. All required statements, reports, summaries, recommendations generated by the departmental review committee and administrators involved in the review process.

E. Composition of Tenure/Promotion Committee

After the Head has examined material submitted by the candidate, the Head will appoint an ad hoc Tenure Review Committee and the chair of such committee. The Tenure Review Committee will be composed of three History Department members who hold the rank of associate professor or professor. The candidate will have the right to name one member of the Tenure Review Committee and the Head will appoint the two remaining members. The Tenure Review Committee will begin its work before the end of April.

F. Departmental Procedures for Tenure and/or Promotion Review:

1. In accordance with the provost's annual timetable for faculty evaluation, the Head and tenure/promotion committee will ensure a complete dossier for the candidate, as described in the Manual for Faculty Evaluation and in any further directives from the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, is made available to the tenured faculty.
2. At the tenure/promotion meeting the chair of the tenure/promotion Committee will submit a report, which will constitute the agenda of the tenure/promotion meeting. The report must review material in the candidate's file, and must be purely objective, without a recommendation on granting or not granting tenure.
3. In keeping with university policy, while the Department Head will attend the discussion of a tenure and/or promotion candidate, he or she shall not participate in the discussion except to clarify issues and assure that proper procedure is followed. Normally the associate head or another full professor will conduct the meeting.
4. The Department Head will select a representative of the faculty eligible to participate in the review discussion to serve as a recorder of this discussion. Upon concluding a thorough discussion of the committee's report, the eligible faculty will vote on a motion concerning granting tenure. The vote will be by secret ballot, and a majority of those voting will be necessary for adoption of the motion. The Head may accept proxy ballots before the meeting from faculty members who cannot be in attendance (and these votes shall be communicated to the chair of the meeting), but no meeting may go forward or vote be taken without a quorum. The recorder shall summarize the faculty discussion and present a written recommendation and vote to the Head. This recommendation

must be available to the candidate and to the departmental faculty review committee so that they may (if they wish) prepare a dissenting statement. This recommendation, the vote, and any dissenting statement become part of the dossier. The candidate will also receive a copy of the tenure committee report, with names of outside readers redacted.

5. The candidate will not enter the Tenure Review meeting during the discussion of his or her qualifications. By majority vote, however, the tenure/promotion meeting may request that the candidate appear to answer questions or clarify circumstances relevant to the qualifications.
6. After conducting a separate review of the candidate's case for tenure and/or promotion, the Department Head will prepare a letter that provides an independent recommendation. This letter must be made available to the candidate and all voting faculty so that they may (if they wish) prepare a dissenting statement. This statement must be submitted no later than two weeks after receipt of the recommendation. The Head's letter, together with any dissenting statement, becomes part of the dossier.
7. Any dissenting statements, which may be submitted by faculty members either individually or collectively, must become part of the dossier and must be available to the candidate and Department Head.

XIV. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

The following guidelines for performance evaluation are specific to the Department of History. They are designed to supplement the criteria and procedures for the University in general that appear in the Manual for Faculty Evaluation. These guidelines should inform and be reflected in annual reviews by the Head of individual faculty.

Faculty should assume that discussions center on, and judgments follow from, performance in three areas – research, teaching, and service – and are based on evidence made available before and during deliberations. Rigorously objective standards on what meets expectations in each area cannot be set down. The following criteria and their qualifications are as specific as possible.

Evidence that a tenured member's ongoing research or creative agenda "meets expectations" normally entails demonstrating significant progress toward presenting his or her current research in an appropriate forum: e.g., publishing a book, article, or essay; presenting a paper at a professional meeting; completing chapters in a proposed book; publishing extended critical reviews reflective of the member's scholarly expertise; etc. "Significant progress" will include recognition that research projects vary in terms of the degree of difficulty and time required. In some years, then, a member may meet expectations even in the absence of a specific publication. Other relevant considerations include the perceived importance of the project, the targeted press or journal, readers' reports, reviews, etc. More specific standards within the examples above will be apparent from the goals the member and the Head jointly establish during the preceding annual performance-and-planning review.

Evidence that a tenured member's teaching "meets expectations" will rely on several kinds of data, all or in part: on student evaluations, peer evaluations, syllabi, grade distribution, exams, assignments, and the development of and experimentation with courses. Peer evaluations will be considered the most conclusive evidence.

Evidence that a tenured member's service "meets expectations" will include the amount and kinds of service to the Department, the College, the University, the profession in general, and the community. It is the significance and quality of service that matters most: e.g., the scope of the service within the profession, the amount of time and effort it requires, and whether it has been done willingly and well.

Furthermore, because levels of achievement in each of the areas are likely to vary from year to year, it is the pattern (that is, average during a sequence or cycle) in the period at issue that matters most. It is also understood that in the cases of extraordinary achievement in one or two of the three areas, and where expectations are met in the other area(s), the highest rating may be the appropriate final evaluation.

A. Annual Performance-and-Planning Reviews

All tenured and probationary faculty will undergo Annual Performance-and-Planning Reviews. The general purposes of these reviews are threefold: to promote faculty development, to ensure professional vitality, and to enable fair personnel decisions.

More specifically the evaluation is to:

1. discern the accomplishments of each faculty member during the current academic year;
2. discern certain areas of performance where there is a need for improvement;
3. determine the degree to which faculty have accomplished goals established in the previous annual review;
4. offer constructive advice and shape goals for the next year; and
5. provide an assessment of each faculty member to the Dean of Arts and Sciences using the evaluation form required by the dean's office and accompanied by a written evaluation when the latter is required by the dean's and provost's offices.

In accordance with the provost's annual timetable for faculty evaluation, the Head will distribute the Faculty Workload Form for faculty to fill out and submit on-line along with the following additional materials:

1. a summary of the past year's plans and goals developed at the previous year's annual review;
2. a summary of the faculty member's activities and accomplishments during the past calendar year in teaching, research/scholarship, and service in

accordance with the Faculty Handbook, Chapter 3.8. The summary may include evidence, if any, of international and intercultural expertise or experience; and

3. a current curriculum vitae.

After submitting these materials, the faculty member will have a personal conference with the Head lasting a half hour or more. The Head will have consulted the form as well as the previous annual review. During the conference they will address all aspects of the faculty member's professional record and achievement of goals. Together they will define a set of reasonable expectations for the current calendar year. The Head will then submit an evaluation on-line. The faculty member must digitally sign the report, which will go to the Dean of Arts and Sciences. The faculty member is entitled to protest the assessment and/or submit a rebuttal. The Annual Performance-and-Planning Review will be important in determining a faculty member's eligibility for merit pay. When awarding merit pay, preference should be given to a faculty member who has published a scholarly monograph or has won an award of national or international distinction.

Faculty members who receive notice from the chief academic officer that they have received ratings of "falls short of meeting expectations" or "falls far short of meeting expectations" must develop a plan of improvement and submit the plan to the Department Head within 30 days of receipt of the fully executed Faculty Annual Evaluation Report (as described in Part II.B.8, Manual for Faculty Evaluation). The faculty member has the responsibility of developing a written response for each area needing attention in the report, including goals and benchmarks for improvements and the resources, if any, to be allocated for this purpose. The faculty member will follow up on this plan at the subsequent reviews.

B. Cumulative Reviews:

Cumulative Reviews will occur when a faculty member in the Department falls under the following circumstances:

1. A faculty member whose annual evaluation results in a rating of unsatisfactory in any of two of five consecutive years.
2. A faculty member whose annual evaluation results in any combination of unsatisfactory or needs improvement rating in any of three of five consecutive years.

The Department Head will notify in writing any faculty member who triggers a Cumulative Review. The notification will be included in the Department Head's annual narrative on the Faculty Annual Evaluation Report. The matter of Cumulative Review will be governed by the procedures specified in the Manual for Faculty Evaluation.

XV. AMENDING THE BYLAWS

The Bylaws may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the faculty present at a regular faculty meeting provided that the amendment has been presented in writing to the faculty along with the announcement of the agenda. An amendment will be proposed by the Advisory Committee or by an ad hoc Bylaws revision committee or by petition of one-fifth of the faculty.

XVI. RATIFICATION

These Bylaws will go into effect immediately upon approval by two-thirds of the faculty not on leave.