

Department of History

Departmental Standards for Promotion and Tenure *and* Annual Reviews of Faculty Performance

Revised June 30, 2011

I. West Texas A&M University Summary of General Guidelines for Promotion & Tenure.

Overview: The standards below apply equally to all tenure track or tenured faculty whether they have 4/4 or 3/3 teaching loads. The general university standards for tenure and promotion are articulated in the WTAMU Promotion and Tenure Policy dated September 20, 2010 and some of them will be summarized and incorporated into this document. However, for a more complete explanation of the general university guidelines it is strongly suggested that one refer to the Promotion and Tenure policy dated September 20, 2010, hereinafter referred to as (PT92010).

The classifications and rankings used to determine eligibility for promotion and/or tenure are the same as those used for annual reviews of faculty performance (ARFP). For a complete explanation of the university guidelines for annual performance reviews, it is suggested that faculty refer to the Annual Review of Faculty Performance policy dated February 2, 2008 and revised January 19, 2010, hereinafter referred to as (ARFP11910).

A. Categories and performance classifications that will be used to evaluate a candidate's eligibility for promotion and tenure at the university, college, and departmental levels.

1. Categories: Faculty members going up for promotion and tenure will be evaluated in three categories: Instructional Responsibilities, Intellectual Contributions, and Professional Service. (PT92010, 3)

2. Performance classifications: Faculty performance in the three categories listed above will be assessed as follows: *Outstanding*, *Excellent*, *Satisfactory/Excellent*, *Satisfactory*, and *Unsatisfactory*. (ARFP11910, 4)

B. University Standards for Promotion and Tenure.

1. Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor:

To be eligible for Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor, a faculty member must be considered *Outstanding* or *Excellent* in the evaluation categories of Instructional Responsibilities, Intellectual Contributions, and Professional Service (based on the definitions for each of these ratings in the Annual Review of Faculty Performance). (PT92010, 4.2)

2. Promotion to the rank of Professor:

To be eligible for Promotion to the Rank of Professor, a faculty member must be considered *Outstanding* in at least one of the two evaluation categories of Instructional Responsibilities or Intellectual Contributions and *Excellent* in the other of these two categories and in the category of Professional Service (based on the definitions for each of these ratings in the Annual Review of Faculty Performance). (PT92010, 4.3)

3. Eligibility for Tenure:

a. An Assistant Professor must be considered either *Outstanding* or *Excellent* in all of the evaluation categories of Instructional Responsibilities, Intellectual Contributions, and Professional Service (based on the definitions for each of these ratings in the ARFP). (PT92010, 4.4.1)

b. Candidates for tenure who were employed at the rank of Associate Professor or (full) Professor must achieve the performance standards required for promotion to the rank that they presently hold to be eligible for tenure consideration. (PT92010, 4.4.2)

c. A tenure-track candidate for tenure who holds the rank of Associate Professor and who chooses to seek both the award of tenure and promotion to the rank of Professor may be awarded tenure even if promotion is denied. (PT92010, 4.4.3)

II. Department of History Standards for Promotion & Tenure.

Overview: Ratings for candidates applying for promotion and tenure will be determined partially by the aggregate summation of each candidate's annual faculty performance reviews during his/her probationary period. The ratings of *Outstanding*, *Excellent*, *Satisfactory/Excellent*, *Satisfactory*, and *Unsatisfactory* apply to the Promotion and Tenure Process and the Annual Faculty Performance Review. Departmental standards for Promotion and Tenure are the same as the University standards stipulated above.

It is the History Department's position that a holistic approach must be used. Consequently, although these performance evaluations are important, it is necessary to maintain a degree of flexibility because many factors may affect a faculty member's annual performance review such as improvement of teaching effectiveness over time, the unpredictability of the publishing process, or the difficulty of obtaining committee assignments.

A. Third Year Review.

All tenure track assistant professors will undergo a third year review as described in (PT92010, 5.2). The third year review will assess each candidate's progress towards promotion and tenure, and will be conducted by the tenured members of the department in consultation with the department head after the completion of the faculty member's third year of employment. If the

faculty member is found to have made unsatisfactory progress towards promotion and tenure they will be given a terminal 9 month contract.

B. Notes Regarding Intellectual Contributions.

1. Peer Reviewed Publication Requirement: **In order to be eligible for promotion and/or tenure, all candidates must publish at least three articles in tier 3 or higher peer reviewed journals or their equivalents during the applicable probationary period.** For the departmental list of journal classifications and their equivalency rankings please see Appendix I.

2. Minimum Standards: It is recognized that the three peer reviewed journal article requirement represents a minimum standard and does not guarantee promotion and/or tenure. Candidates who publish only three peer reviewed articles during the probationary period must also engage in substantial additional intellectual contributions as defined in (ARFP11910, 3.2.2) and in II. C. 2. below to successfully attain promotion and/or tenure.

3. Journal Rankings: For a candidate to merely meet the minimum peer review publication requirement outlined above there will not be any distinction made between the different classifications of peer-reviewed journals. However, for ARFP, journal classifications will be considered to determine categorization and merit, and their associated point values will affect the strength of the candidate's P&T rankings in the area of Intellectual Contributions.

4. A Note on Multi-Authored Publications: It is the stated position of the West Texas A&M administration that single and multi-authored articles should receive equal weight when assessing a candidate's Intellectual Contributions for purposes of the P&T evaluation. Therefore, there will not be any differentiation at the departmental level between single and multi-authored publications for purposes of P&T. The department head will distinguish between them for purposes of ARFP and merit pay assessment and will recalculate their point values when the candidate applies for P&T.

C. Additional Comments Regarding Promotion and Tenure.

1. Early Promotion and Tenure:

A faculty member may apply for early promotion and/or tenure, however in order to successfully advance they must demonstrate "significantly higher levels of achievement" within the truncated time period than most of their tenure track peers within the regular probationary period. (PT92010, 2.9) Additionally, History faculty who desire to apply for early promotion and/or tenure may only do so if at the time of the application they would merit departmental rankings of *Outstanding* in Teaching Effectiveness, Intellectual Contributions, and Professional Service during a regular five year probationary period. Further, no member of the History Department may apply for early tenure and promotion more than one year early.

2. The Departmental Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee:

The University P&T standards set forth several scenarios for the departmental P&T process. (PT92010, 5.5.1). The History Department P&T Committee shall consist of four tenured faculty members from within the department and a tenured faculty member from outside the college. The department head may not serve on the Departmental P&T committee.

3. Campus Leadership Requirement:

Candidates desiring promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor must, in addition to the requirements set forth elsewhere in this document, demonstrate qualities of campus leadership beyond the attainment of classifications of “*Outstanding*” or “*Excellent*” in the three evaluation categories described above. Although this requirement is difficult to quantify, examples of campus leaders who have successfully attained the rank of full professor include the Honors Program Director and administrative positions such as Associate Provost. Holding Faculty Senate offices and receiving awards voted upon by peers would also be examples of campus leadership.

4. Collegiality:

Collegiality is no longer a separate category. However, a broader element entitled “Collaboration, Communication, Participation, [and] Professionalism,” is now included as part of the three categories described above.

D. Departmental Standards for Promotion and Tenure by Category.

1. Instructional Responsibilities:

To be considered for a rating of *Outstanding* over the appropriate probationary period, faculty members will document the standards of *Excellent* plus:

- Scores on the CIEQ Instructor Mean that are at least .4 above the University average for classes at the same level, of the same or similar size, taught in the same format, with a student response rate of greater than or equal to 50%.
- AND/OR as adjusted for honors, awards, or recognition for teaching excellence from the University or the profession.
- AND/OR substantial program creation or development.
- AND/OR excellent reviews from several peer evaluations.
- AND/OR as adjusted for additional documentation of Teaching Effectiveness, Teaching Innovation and Learning Assurance, Teaching Load and Instructional Contributions, Quality of Communication with Students, and/or Academic Development as outlined in (ARFP11910, 3.2.1, A-F).

To be considered for a rating of *Excellent* over the appropriate probationary period, faculty members will document the standards for *Satisfactory/Excellent* plus:

- Scores on the CIEQ Instructor Mean that are at least .2 points above the University average for classes at the same level, of the same or similar size, taught in the same format, with a student response rate of greater than or equal to 50%.
- § AND/OR as adjusted for an appropriate combination of large classes (50 or more students), new preparations, record of curriculum innovation, exhibited program leadership, or individual student direction.
- § AND/OR as adjusted for additional documentation of Teaching Effectiveness, Teaching Innovation and Learning Assurance, Teaching Load and Instructional Contributions, Quality of Communication with Students, and/or Academic Development as outlined in (ARFP11910, 3.2.1, A-F).

To be considered for a rating of *Satisfactory/Excellent* over the appropriate probationary period, faculty members will document the following standards:

- Scores on the CIEQ Instructor Mean that are less than .2 above and are at least equal to the University average for classes at the same level, of the same or similar size, taught in the same format, with a student response rate of greater than or equal to 50%.
- § AND the maintenance of accurate and detailed course syllabi and timely response to and return of graded student work.
- § AND regular availability to students and effective communication with students both in and out of class.
- § AND/OR as adjusted for additional documentation of Teaching Effectiveness, Teaching Innovation and Learning Assurance, Teaching Load and Instructional Contributions, Quality of Communication with Students, and/or Academic Development as outlined in (ARFP11910, 3.2.1, A-F).

To be considered for a rating of *Satisfactory* over the appropriate probationary period, faculty members will document the following standards:

- Scores on the CIEQ Instructor Mean that are no more than .5 points below the University average for classes at the same level taught, of the same or similar size, taught in the same format, with a student response rate of greater than or equal to 50%.
- § Maintenance of accurate and detailed course syllabi and timely response to and return of graded student work.
- § Regular availability to students and effective communication with students both in and out of class.

Faculty members who do not qualify for one of the rankings above will receive a rating of *Unsatisfactory* for the probationary period.

2. Intellectual Contributions:

Note: Point values for intellectual contributions will be found in the ARFP Guidelines located in Section III. B. below.

To be considered for a rating of *Outstanding*, faculty members will engage in scholarly activities that total 150 points or greater over the probationary period including:

- § The publication of a historical monograph with a university press.
- § AND/OR the publication of a combination of book length works that are acceptable as articulated below in the ARFP and peer reviewed journal articles and/or book chapters in peer reviewed publications.
- § AND/OR the publication of one article in a journal rated “beyond category,” and two additional peer reviewed journal articles or book chapters in peer reviewed publications.
- § AND/OR the publication of a combination of peer reviewed journal articles in tier 3 journals or above and/or book chapters in peer reviewed publications totaling five or greater.
- § AND/OR the funding of any grant classified as “beyond category” or “Fulbright level” in combination with at least two peer reviewed journal articles and/or book chapters in peer reviewed publications.
- § AND/OR engage in conference presentations and/or other types of intellectual contributions as defined in (ARFP11910, 3.2.2) in combination with one or more of the above.
- § AND/OR engage in other types of intellectual contributions related to any of the above as defined by the departmental ARFP standards in combination with one or more of the above.

To be considered for a rating of *Excellent* faculty members will engage in scholarly activities totaling less than 150 but greater than or equal to 100 points over the probationary period including:

- § The publication of a historical monograph with a university press.
- § AND/OR the publication of a combination of book length works that are acceptable as articulated below in the ARFP and peer reviewed journal articles and/or book chapters in peer reviewed publications.
- § AND/OR the publication of one article in a journal rated “beyond category,” and one additional peer reviewed journal article or book chapter in a peer reviewed publication.
- § AND/OR the publication of a combination of peer reviewed journal articles in tier 3 journals or above and/or book chapters in peer reviewed publications totaling three or more.
- § AND/OR the funding of any grant classified as “beyond category” or “Fulbright level” in combination with at least two peer reviewed journal articles.
- § AND/OR engage in conference presentations and/or other types of intellectual contributions as defined in (ARFP11910, 3.2.2) in combination with one or more of the above.

- § AND/OR engage in other types of intellectual contributions related to any of the above as defined by the departmental ARFP standards in combination with one or more of the above.

To be considered for a rating of *Satisfactory/Excellent* faculty members will document the following standards:

- § Any combination of the intellectual contributions described above that totals less than 100 and greater than or equal to 50 points.
- § Any combination of the intellectual contributions described totaling 100 points or greater that does not include the publication of three peer reviewed articles in tier 3 journals or their equivalents as outlined in the ARFP below.

To be considered for a rating of *Satisfactory* faculty members will document the following standards:

- § Any combination of the intellectual contributions described above that totals less than 50 and more than 20.
- § Any combination of the intellectual contributions described totaling between 99-50 points that does not include the publication of two peer reviewed articles in tier 3 journals or their equivalents as outlined in the ARFP below.

Faculty members who do not qualify for one of the rankings above will receive a ranking of *Unsatisfactory* for the probationary period.

3. Professional Service:

To be considered for a rating of *Outstanding*, the faculty member will document the standards of *Excellent* plus at least three of the following:

- § Active membership on four committees beyond the departmental level that meet frequently.
- § Committee chair beyond the department level.
- § External organization board membership or elected office.
- § Program administration or coordination.
- § The publication of a scholarly book review in a tier 1 journal or above.
- § Teaching an unpaid course overload—not including independent studies.
- § Assessing grant applications for a national or international agency or government entity.
- § Effective representation of the department as a member of the Faculty Senate.
- § Engaging in other significant service opportunities inside or outside of the university to be evaluated on a case by case basis by the department head.

To be considered for a rating of *Excellent*, the faculty member will document the standards for *Satisfactory/Excellent* plus at least two of the following:

- § Active membership on three committees beyond the departmental level that meet frequently.
- § Organization sponsorship (WTAMU or professional organization).
- § Membership on two committees of appropriate professional organizations.
- § Committee chair at any level.
- § Presentations to civic organizations and groups.
- § Sustained non-committee based service to the University or to the community.
- § Assessing grant applications for a national or international agency or government entity.
- § Participation in university sponsored student recruitment activities.
- § The publication of a scholarly book review in a peer-reviewed journal of any tier.
- § The publication of 4 book reviews in pedagogical venues such as Choice or Library Journal.
- § Engaging in other significant service opportunities inside or outside of the university to be evaluated on a case by case basis by the department head.

To be considered for a rating of *Satisfactory/Excellent*, the faculty member will document the following standards:

- § Regular and timely attendance at department and college meetings.
- § Membership on two academic committees of any kind, at any level (recognizing that decisions about committee membership are often beyond the faculty member's control).
- § Responsible student advising.

To be considered for a rating of *Satisfactory*, the faculty member will document the following standards:

- § Regular and timely attendance at department and college meetings.
- § Responsible student advising.
- § All other activities and duties incumbent upon every member of the university faculty to fulfill.

Faculty members who do not qualify for one of the rankings above will receive a ranking of *Unsatisfactory* for the probationary period.

III. Department of History General Guidelines for Annual Reviews of Faculty Performance (ARFP) used to determine eligibility for merit pay increases.

Overview: Each faculty member will prepare an Annual Activity Report and submit it to the department head by February 1st of each year. This Activity Report will accurately list the faculty member's accomplishments during the preceding calendar year. (ARFP11910, 1.1). The Annual Activity Report will consist of three parts including the Annual Professional Summary Document prepared with the Sedona© software, a two page self assessment, and a description of goals and the percentage weights the faculty member wishes to assign to the three evaluation categories. (ARFP11910, 1.6, 1-3)

A. Categories and Performance Classifications.

The Categories and Performance Classifications that will be used to evaluate a candidate's ranking for purposes of the ARFP are the same as those used to evaluate a candidate's eligibility for promotion and tenure at the university, college, and departmental levels.

1. Categories: Faculty members will be evaluated in three categories: Instructional Responsibilities, Intellectual Contributions, and Professional Service.
2. Performance Classifications: Faculty performance in the three categories listed above will be assessed as follows: *Outstanding*, *Excellent*, *Satisfactory/Excellent*, *Satisfactory*, and *Unsatisfactory*.
3. Each of the first three performance classification will be assigned a numerical value between 4 and 0, with 4 being the highest possible rating. (ARFP11910, 4.1-4.2 inclusive)

B. Departmental Standards applied to ARFP and the determination of merit eligibility by category.

1. Instructional Responsibilities:

A. Overview: There are five areas in which a faculty member's Instructional Responsibilities will be assessed: Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness, Teaching Innovation and Learning Assurance, Teaching Load and Instructional Contributions, Quality of Communication with Students, and Academic Development (ARFP11910, 3.2.1). To attain the highest possible ratings in Instructional Responsibilities, a faculty member must document activity in all of these areas. To obtain a complete description of each of these areas of evaluation please reference (ARFP11910, 3.2.1, A-F).

Although there are five areas of evaluation, Teaching Effectiveness remains the most important and will be weighted accordingly. Teaching Innovation and Learning Assurance will also be given a higher weight than the remaining three categories. Please refer to (ARFP11910, 4.1-4.2 inclusive) and the Annual Activity Evaluation Form attached to it for a comprehensive

description of the ratings system and the weights that will be assigned as described above.

B. Instructional Responsibilities Assessment:

To be considered for a rating of *Outstanding* (4.0-3.6) for the academic year under evaluation faculty members will document the standards of *Excellent* plus:

- Scores on the CIEQ Instructor Mean that are at least .4 above the University average for classes at the same level, of the same or similar size, taught in the same format, with a student response rate of greater than or equal to 50%.
- § AND/OR as adjusted for honors, awards, or recognition for teaching excellence from the University or the profession.
- § AND/OR substantial program creation or development.
- § AND/OR excellent reviews from several peer evaluations.
- § AND/OR as adjusted for additional documentation of Teaching Effectiveness, Teaching Innovation and Learning Assurance, Teaching Load and Instructional Contributions, Quality of Communication with Students, and/or Academic Development as outlined in (ARFP11910, 3.2.1, A-F).

To be considered for a rating of *Excellent* (3.5-3.0) for the academic year under evaluation, faculty members will document the standards for *Satisfactory/Excellent* plus:

- Scores on the CIEQ Instructor Mean that are at least .2 points above the University average for classes at the same level, of the same or similar size, taught in the same format, with a student response rate of greater than or equal to 50%.
- § AND/OR as adjusted for an appropriate combination of large classes (50 or more students), new preparations, record of curriculum innovation, exhibited program leadership, or individual student direction.
- § AND/OR as adjusted for additional documentation of Teaching Effectiveness, Teaching Innovation and Learning Assurance, Teaching Load and Instructional Contributions, Quality of Communication with Students, and/or Academic Development as outlined in (ARFP11910, 3.2.1, A-F).

To be considered for a rating of *Satisfactory/Excellent* (2.9-2.5) for the academic year under evaluation, faculty members will document the following standards:

- § Scores on the CIEQ Instructor Mean that are less than .2 above and are at least equal to the University average for classes at the same level, of the same or similar size, taught in the same format.
- § AND Maintenance of accurate and detailed course syllabi and timely response to and return of graded student work.
- § AND Regular availability to students and effective communication with students both in and out of class.

- § AND/OR as adjusted for additional documentation of Teaching Effectiveness, Teaching Innovation and Learning Assurance, Teaching Load and Instructional Contributions, Quality of Communication with Students, and/or Academic Development as outlined in (ARFP11910, 3.2.1, A-F).

To be considered for a rating of *Satisfactory* (2.4-2.0) for the academic year under evaluation, faculty members will document the following standards:

- Scores on the CIEQ Instructor Mean that are no more than .5 points below the University average for classes at the same level taught, of the same or similar size, taught in the same format, with a student response rate of greater than or equal to 50%.
- § Maintenance of accurate and detailed course syllabi and timely response to and return of graded student work.
- § Regular availability to students and effective communication with students both in and out of class.

Faculty members who do not qualify for one of the rankings above will receive a ranking of *Unsatisfactory* (1.9-0.0) for the academic year.

2. Intellectual Contributions:

A. Overview: Intellectual Contributions are specifically delineated in (ARFP11910, 3.2.2, A-D).

To be considered for a rating of *Outstanding* (4.0-3.6) for the academic year under evaluation, faculty members will engage in a combination of scholarly activities that totals 30 points or greater that includes:

- § The publication of a historical monograph with a university press. (Point total may be split for 2 years)
- § OR the publication of a scholarly book or anthology. (Point total may be split for 2 years)
- § OR the publication of one article in a journal rated “beyond category.”
- § OR the publication of one peer reviewed journal article in a tier 3 journal in combination with other “intellectual contributions” as defined in Appendix I that totals 25 points or greater.
- § OR the funding of any grant classified as “beyond category” (may be split for 2 years) or “Fulbright Level.”
- § AND/OR engage in conference presentations and/or other types of intellectual contributions as defined in section 3.2.2 of the (ARFP11910) in combination with one or more of the above.
- § AND/OR engage in other types of intellectual contributions related to any of the above as defined by the departmental ARFP standards in combination with one or more of the above.

To be considered for a rating of *Excellent* (3.5-3.0) for the academic year under evaluation, faculty members will engage in a combination of scholarly activities that totals between 29.9-20 points that includes:

- § The publication of a scholarly book or anthology. (Point total may be split for 2 years)
- § OR the publication of one peer reviewed journal article in a tier 3 journal in combination with other “intellectual contributions” as defined in Appendix I that totals between 29.9-20 points.
- § OR the funding of any grant classified as “Fulbright Level.”
- § OR engage in conference presentations and/or other types of intellectual contributions as defined in section 3.2.2 of the (ARFP11910) in combination with one or more of the above.
- § AND/OR engage in other types of intellectual contributions related to any of the above as defined by the departmental ARFP standards in combination with one or more of the above.

To be considered for a rating of *Satisfactory/Excellent* (2.9-2.5) for the academic year under evaluation, faculty members will engage in a combination of scholarly activities that totals between 19.9-10 points as outlined in Appendix I below.

To be considered for a rating of *Satisfactory* (2.4-2.0) for the academic year under evaluation, faculty members will engage in a combination of scholarly activities that totals between 9.9-4 points as outlined in Appendix I below.

Faculty members who do not qualify for one of the rankings above will receive a ranking of *Unsatisfactory* for the academic year under evaluation.

3. Professional Service:

To be considered for a rating of *Outstanding* (4.0-3.6) for the academic year under evaluation, the faculty member will document the standards for *Satisfactory/Excellent* plus at least five of the following:

- § Active membership on two university or college level committees that meet frequently.
- § Committee chair beyond the department level.
- § External organization board membership or elected office.
- § Program administration.
- § The publication of a scholarly book review in a tier 1 journal or above.
- § Teaching an unpaid course overload—not including independent studies.
- § Assessing grant applications for a national or international agency or government entity.
- § Effective representation of the department as a member of the Faculty Senate.
- § Organization sponsorship (WTAMU or professional organization).
- § Presentations to civic organizations and groups.
- § Sustained non-committee based service to the University or to the community.
- § Participation in university sponsored student recruitment activities.

- § Engaging in significant service opportunities inside or outside of the university to be evaluated on a case by case basis by the department head.

To be considered for a rating of *Excellent* (3.5-3.0) for the academic year under evaluation, the faculty member will document the standards for *Satisfactory/Excellent* plus at least three of the following:

- § Active membership on two committees at any level that meet frequently.
- § Organization sponsorship (WTAMU or professional organization).
- § Committee chair at any level.
- § Presentations to civic organizations and groups.
- § Sustained non-committee based service to the University or to the community.
- § The publication of a scholarly book review in a peer-reviewed journal of any tier.
- § Assessing grant applications for a national or international agency or government entity.
- § Participation in university sponsored student recruitment activities.
- § Engaging in significant service opportunities inside or outside of the university to be evaluated on a case by case basis by the department head.
- § The publication of four book reviews in pedagogical venues such as Choice or Library Journal.

To be considered for a rating of *Satisfactory/Excellent* (2.9-2.5) for the academic year under evaluation, the faculty member will document the following standards:

- § Regular attendance at department and college meetings.
- § Membership on two academic committees of any kind, at any level (recognizing that decisions about committee membership are often beyond the faculty member's control).
- § Responsible student advising.

To be considered for a rating of *Satisfactory* (2.4-2.0) for the academic year under evaluation, the faculty member will document the following standards:

- § Regular attendance at department and college meetings regularly.
- § Responsible student advising.
- § All other activities and duties incumbent upon every member of the university faculty to fulfill.

Faculty members who do not qualify for one of the rankings above will receive a ranking of *Unsatisfactory* for the academic year under evaluation.

IV. Department of History Scholarship Equivalency Guide for Promotion & Tenure and Annual Faculty Performance Reviews.

Overview: This document will set equivalency standards for the various types of intellectual contributions engaged in by the faculty of the West Texas A&M University Department of History for purposes of promotion and tenure (P&T) and for the annual reviews of faculty performance (ARFP) that will be utilized by the department head and the dean to determine eligibility for merit pay increases.

In light of its heavy teaching responsibilities, the Department of History has established a minimum P&T standard of three peer reviewed journal articles (PRJ) ranked as tier 3 or higher as defined below, along with “other significant types of research activity,” to justify advancement in rank and for earning tenure.¹ Given that Promotion and Tenure are inextricably linked to the annual activities of faculty and that the History Department faculty produce many different types of peer-reviewed publications, **the department will use the peer reviewed journal article requirement as a common denominator by which to establish P&T equivalencies for these different kinds of scholarship.** These equivalences will apply to the ARFP as well as the Promotion and Tenure process. Point values will be assigned to each type of Intellectual Contribution for the purpose of calculating P&T and ARFP rankings.

All faculty members should be aware of (ARFP11910, 5.2.3), inclusive, which specifies certain conditions that will render a faculty member ineligible for merit regardless of rating or point total for the academic year under evaluation.

A. Journal Rankings and Point Values.

1. Beyond Category. (50 points)

Defined as the most prestigious journals in which academic historians may publish. These journals are usually national or international in scope. Examples include the American Historical Review, Speculum, Hispanic American Historical Review, and the Journal of Asian Studies.

2. Tier 1. (25 points)

Defined as prestigious refereed journals that are usually published by field-specific professional organizations or consortiums of academic departments. These can be regional in scope, although occasionally a state level journal may also be ranked in this category depending upon the sub-discipline in question. Examples include, Journal of Latin American Studies, William and Mary Quarterly, Pacific Historical Review, Western Historical Quarterly, Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, Japan Studies Review.

¹Section II.B.1., of this document.

3. Tier 2. (15 points)

Defined as scholarly peer-reviewed journals typically published by state historical societies or regional associations. Examples include Journal of Arizona History, the Latin Americanist, and the Southwest Journal of Asian Studies

4. Tier 3. (10 points)

Defined as scholarly peer-reviewed journals typically published by museums, honor societies, individual academic departments, or small regional historical associations. These journals are generally published once or twice a year. Examples include Panhandle Plains Historical Review, the West Texas Historical Association Yearbook, and Politics Bureaucracy and Justice.

5. Tier 4. (1 point)

Defined as any journal that operates on a pay-to-publish basis even if it is ostensibly peer reviewed. Although WTAMU has recognized them as meeting the peer reviewed scholarship requirement for P&T in the past, the Department of History does not. Examples include, but are not limited to, all journals linked to the following website: <<http://www.nationalforum.com/>>

6. A Note on Multi-Authored Publications.

As stated in Section II. C. 4 above there will not be any differentiation at the departmental level between single and multi-authored publications for purposes of P&T, however, the department head will distinguish between them for purposes of ARFP and eligibility for merit increases.

B. Other Refereed Publications that can be substituted for the P&T PRJ requirement (includes scholarship type, PRJ equivalency, and point value)

1. Scholarly Monographs. (Should be spread out over two years)

- \$ Six tier one/10 tier two/15 tier three journal articles (for P&T)
- \$ 150 points (for ARFP)

2. Other Scholarly Book-Length Works. Can be spread out over two years)

- \$ Three tier one/5 tier two/7.5 tier three journal articles (for P&T)
- \$ 75 points (for ARFP)

3. Edited Anthologies to which the editor contributes at least one article. (Can be spread out over two years)

- \$ Three tier one/5 tier two/7.5 tier three journal articles (for P&T)
- \$ 75 points (For ARFP)

4. Book Chapters/Articles that appear in anthologies.
 \$ Either one tier one or one tier two journal article—as determined by the department head.
 (for P&T)
 \$ 25/15 points (for ARFP)
5. Articles accepted for publication—verified by letter from journal editor.
 \$ Documented acceptance of an article in a PRJ not published during the evaluatory period
 will be credited in full. (for P&T)
 \$ 5 points. (for ARFP)

C. Other refereed intellectual contributions that cannot be substituted for the P&T PRJ requirement and their point equivalencies. They will count, however, towards each candidate's aggregate point totals for both P&T and ARFP.

1. Publications.
 \$ Conference Proceedings (5 points)
2. Conference Presentations.
 \$ National/International (15 points)
 \$ Regional (10 points)
 \$ State/Local (7.5 points)
3. Grants: Only funded grants will count towards intellectual contributions for purposes of P&T and the ARFP (ARFP11910, 3.2.2, A)
 \$ Beyond Category: Guggenheim/MacArthur Level (150 points may be split for 2 years)
 \$ Tier One: Fulbright Level (50-35 points)
 \$ Tier Two: Regional/State Level (10 points)

D. Other Intellectual Contributions not specifically enumerated that will count towards each candidate's aggregate point totals for both P&T and ARFP. (ARFP11910, 3.2)

- \$ Encyclopedia Articles (2.5 points)
 \$ Conference Participation/Attendance
 1. Discussant (6 points)
 2. Panel Chair (3 points)
 3. Attendance (1.5 points)
 \$ Invited Scholarly Lectures and Presentations (5 points)
 \$ Peer-Reviewed Scholarship that is under review or in progress (excludes articles accepted for publication). (Points to be determined by the Department Head)
 \$ Other Work in Progress: (Points to be determined by the Department Head).

§ Additionally, it is recognized that the department faculty may engage in Intellectual Contributions other than those specifically described above. (ARFP11910, 3.2)
Therefore, the department head will assess a point value for these activities for purposes of both ARFP and P&T. Examples of these may include (but are not limited to) writing and editing a book or article that has not yet been published, refereeing manuscripts for professional journals or university presses, editing a scholarly journal for a professional organization, and/or writing grants that have yet to be funded.

F. ARFP Definitions Governing Intellectual Contributions

The Annual Review of Faculty Performance that will be used to evaluate faculty starting with the 2008 academic year includes a far more restrictive assessment of scholarship than the Annual Professional Summary forms that have been used previously. Please be advised that the following will no longer be classified as scholarship under the new guidelines for purposes of the annual reviews.

Book Reviews of any type--now service (3.2.3, C)²
Dissertation/Thesis committee work--now teaching (3.2.1, C)

² Although the current Provost recognizes that disciplines containing a literature component such as History typically view the publication of book reviews in refereed journals as Intellectual Contributions, WTAMU's policy remains unchanged at the present.

Appendix I

Department of History
Table of Scholarship and Associated Point Values in Descending Order
November 2010

Scholarship Type	PRJ EQ (Peer Reviewed Journal Article Equivalency)	Points	Other
Publications, P&T Equivalencies & Point Values for ARFP.			
Books			
Monograph	6 tier 1/10tier 2/15 tier 3 articles	150	spread over 2 years
Scholarly Book	3 tier 1/5tier 2/7.5 tier 3 articles	75	spread over 2 years
Edited Collection/Anthology	3 tier 1/5 tier 2/7.5 tier 3 articles	75	spread over 2 years
Note: Book length works <u>accepted</u> for publication will only count for P&T, not ARFP.			
Articles/Article Length Works			
Beyond Category	N/A	50	
Tier 1	N/A	25	
Tier 2	N/A	15	
Tier 3	N/A	10	
Tier 4	N/A	1	
Articles accepted but not published by the end of the evaluatory period.	N/A	5	Article will count as published for P&T

Book chapters/articles in edited works	1 tier one or tier two article	25/15	
Other Publications & Point Values for ARFP only. (No PRJ P&T Equivalentts)			
Conference proceedings	N/A	5	
Encyclopedia articles	N/A	2.5	
Other Intellectual Contributions & Point Values for ARFP only. (No PRJ P&T Equivalentts)			
Conference Presentations			
National/International	N/A	15	
Major Regional	N/A	10	
State/Local	N/A	5	
Poster Presentations	N/A	2.5	
Conference Participation/Attendance			
Discussant	N/A	6	
Panel Chair	N/A	4	
Attendance	N/A	1.5	
Grant Activity			
Beyond Category Guggenheim/MacArthur Level	N/A	150	
Tier 1 Fulbright/Fulbright-Hays Level	N/A	50-35	
Tier 2 Regional/State Level	N/A	10	

Tier 3 Local/University Level	N/A	5	
Invited Lectures and/or Scholarly Presentations	N/A	5	
Other Work in Progress	N/A	TBD	