

Department of History Faculty Handbook

Last Amended 2 May 2007

CONTENTS:	page
Handbook	2
Appendix A: EVALUATIONS FOR REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND ANNUAL REVIEW	14
Appendix B: PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING	24
Appendix C: PROCEDURE FOR SELECTING A DEPARTMENT CHAIR	26
Appendix D: ALLOCATION OF DEPARTMENT RESEARCH FUNDS	28
Appendix E: FLEXIBLE TEACHING AGREEMENTS	29
Appendix F: TENURE-TRACK RESEARCH RELEASE	31
Appendix G: THIRD-YEAR REVIEW	32
Appendix H: POST-TENURE REVIEW POLICIES AND PROCEDURES	35
Appendix I: TEACHING LOAD	42
Appendix J: STANDING COMMITTEES	43

Department of History Faculty Handbook

Last Amended: 2 May 2007

Preamble

In order to ensure that all members of the History Department work in an environment that supports and encourages the research, teaching, and service responsibilities required of them, the members of the Department have approved the following guidelines for the organization and governance of the Department.

The structure represented in these guidelines has been designed to foster a spirit of collegiality and shared governance within a Chair model of leadership. The guidelines are intended to outline the rights and obligations of faculty members and to describe the administrative structure of the Department.

The Department's guidelines are intended for internal governance, and they are not intended to override regulations established by the University or the College. Anything in the handbook found to be in conflict with University or College guidelines will be deemed invalid and subject to prompt revision.

Membership

The Regular Faculty of the Department consists of all persons holding full-time appointments or joint appointments in the Department, tenured and tenure-track. The Regular Faculty has full participatory and voting rights in all matters coming before the Department and in all elections to office.

The General Faculty of the Department consists of the Regular Faculty, together with all persons holding emeritus, part-time, adjunct, or visiting faculty status.

Values and Goals

In an effort to create a more inclusive and supportive academic community, members of the Department of History embrace the Virginia Tech Principles of Community as formally adopted by the Board of Visitors on March 15, 2005:

- We affirm the inherent dignity and value of every person and strive to maintain a climate for work and learning based on mutual respect and understanding.
- We affirm the right of each person to express thoughts and opinions freely. We encourage open expression within a climate of civility, sensitivity, and mutual respect.
- We affirm the value of human diversity because it enriches our lives and the University. We acknowledge and respect our differences while affirming our common humanity.

- We reject all forms of prejudice and discrimination, including those based on age, color, disability, gender, national origin, political affiliation, race, religion, sexual orientation, and veteran status. We take individual and collective responsibility for helping to eliminate bias and discrimination and for increasing our own understanding of these issues through education, training, and interaction with others.

In addition, we declare that:

1. Colleagues should acknowledge one another's competence, professional expertise, and service to students, colleagues, the university, and the profession without regard to gender; male colleagues should be willing to engage female colleagues in genuine intellectual dialogue around issues of scholarship and research, not just teaching, and should be able to identify women as role models and recommend that others emulate their performance; and evaluations should be conducted without reference to gender.
2. We are peers in a common enterprise no matter our rank.
3. Individuals should be recognized and rewarded for their unique contributions to the collective identity of the department.
4. We will recognize dual career couples when appropriate as an effective tool for recruiting and retaining faculty.
5. It is our collective and individual responsibility to identify, resist, and rebut unacceptable language and behavior; the onus should not fall on the offended individual.
6. The department will support a diverse and rigorous intellectual climate, and our teaching will reflect current historical scholarship.
7. We value an open and transparent exchange of ideas.
8. We will seek a genuinely inclusive environment.
9. We will handle disagreements in a professional manner.
10. We will work to expand the leadership opportunities available to women.
11. We will value diversity and seek to become more diverse.
12. We will not be held hostage to the past.
13. Junior faculty will have access to inclusive, constructive, and professional mentoring.
14. Colleagues will be willing to share equally the responsibility for effective service within the department.
15. Professionalism will be the guiding principle of conduct in the department, and we will respect the boundaries between professional and personal lives.

16. Neither harassment nor discrimination of any sort will be tolerated. Those who harass or discriminate will be held accountable; those who suffer harassment or discrimination will receive our unqualified support; and those who recognize harassment or discrimination or participate in the grievance process will be protected from retaliation.

17. We acknowledge the consequences and operation of male privilege in professional settings, in personnel processes, and especially in the treatment of female colleagues; call on male faculty to assume responsibility for addressing systemic iniquities that result from sexist behavior; and recognize that complaints about “lowered” standards or “preferential” treatment are often excuses used by men who are losing their positions of unquestioned privilege.

18. We will acknowledge that family matters sometimes affect our teaching, research, and service obligations, and members will not be penalized for time taken to meet these obligations, though family obligations will not be used as an excuse to avoid participating in the academic and service life of the department.

19. We will take steps to eliminate pay inequities based on gender.

20. We will revisit who we are and who we want to be on a fairly regular basis.

21. The staff are members of the History Department. They contribute not only to its essential operations, but also to the pride of place recognized in an exemplary department. At all times, they should be treated with the same courtesy, respect, civility, and professionalism that faculty members expect of their colleagues.

Rights and Obligations of the Regular Faculty

All Regular Faculty of the History Department have the:

- Right and obligation to participate fully in department governance and the creation of department policies.
- Right to be informed by the Chair of policies affecting the department and its members and the obligation to remain informed.
- Right to request a faculty vote on policies and issues affecting the department and its faculty.
- The obligation to accept as policy, decisions agreed to by a majority of the Regular Faculty, and to serve the department in ways that implement the policies.

I. Department Meetings

A. Department meetings are scheduled regularly for the purposes of making policy, reviewing the department's budget, setting hiring priorities, sharing committee reports, making general announcements, and conducting other business as it arises.

B. All members of the Department -- General Faculty and Staff -- are invited to attend Department meetings and participate in discussions.

1. One or more undergraduate students may be invited to participate, without vote, in meetings of the Department.

2. One or more graduate students may be invited to participate, without vote, in meetings of the Department.

C. The right to vote in Department meetings is limited to Regular Faculty.

1. Votes require the presence of a quorum, which will consist of one-half of the Regular Faculty not on leave during the semester.

2. A secret ballot shall be required for any vote at the request of any member of the Regular Faculty.

D. The Department will meet at least once each full month during the fall and spring semesters.

1. The Chair may call special meetings of the Department with or without advance notice.

2. At the request of any Regular Faculty member, the Chair will convene a special meeting of the Department within one calendar week.

E. The Chair of the Department or an appointed alternate presides at Department meetings.

1. The Chair will solicit agenda items from Department members in advance of the meeting and circulate an agenda for the meeting at least 24 hours in advance.

2. The agenda will include reports from the chairs of standing committees.

F. The Department will keep a permanent record of minutes of all Department meetings.

1. Responsibility for taking minutes during a meeting will rotate, alphabetically among the Regular Faculty, and the Chair will maintain this rotation.

2. Draft minutes of Department meetings will be circulated electronically to faculty and staff within ten days after the meeting, and approval of the minutes will be the first item on the next meeting's agenda.

3. The minutes, as approved (and amended, if necessary) at a Department meeting become the permanent record.

II. Department Officers and Standing Committees

A. Department Chair

1. The Department prefers the designation Chair rather than Head. This title reflects the Department's commitment to a consultative, shared approach to governance, though the Department recognizes that the formal governance structure of the University and College holds the Department Chair specifically responsible for all actions of the Department. The Chair's ambiguous position between Department and College makes consensus-building and shared decision-making a core responsibility of anyone holding this position.
2. The University Faculty Handbook prescribes the Chair's responsibilities: Departments are under the supervision of the department heads or chairs who are responsible to the dean of the college. Department heads or chairs are responsible for the growth and vigor of the academic programs, for the recruiting of new faculty, and for the administration of the curriculum and budget of their departments. . . .
3. The Department holds elections to determine its choice for Chair. The nomination is then forwarded to the Dean of the College.
 - a. Any tenured Faculty member is eligible to serve as Department Chair.
 - b. The election process is defined in Appendix C of the History Department Faculty Handbook
4. The term for Chair shall be three years, renewable once.
5. Each year the Department, through its Executive Committee, will arrange for an informal, internal evaluation of the Department Chair by faculty and staff. During a reelection year the Executive Committee will arrange for a formal, written evaluation to be submitted to the Dean of the College.
6. The Chair's primary responsibilities to the Department and the faculty include (but are clearly not limited to):
 - a. Overseeing the fulfillment of the Department's teaching, research, and service missions.
 - b. Serving as liaison between the Department and the University and the College.
 1. Represent the Department's interests to the University and College.
 2. Inform the History Department faculty of changes in University and College administrative policies.
 3. Make regular oral and/or written reports to the Department on items of interest and concern to the faculty that arise at levels beyond the Department and seek faculty guidance in developing the Department's stance.
 4. Make available to the faculty formal reports about the status of the Department, unless the Dean requests otherwise.

c. Working with the Department's standing committees as an ex officio, non-voting member of all committees.

1. Oversee electronic elections for the Executive Committee, the Research Committee, and the Teaching Review Committee membership and ensure that all Regular Faculty (including those not in residence at the time of the election) have an opportunity to stand for election and to vote.

2. Determine membership of standing committees.

3. Call first meeting of standing committees early in the fall semester to set priorities for the year and elect committee chairs.

4. Identify and promote candidates for awards and distinctions.

d. Handling of personnel issues.

1. Participate in the Executive Committee's annual evaluations of faculty.

2. Recommend to the Dean all annual salary adjustments.

3. Work with faculty to develop hiring priorities and strategies.

4. Oversee recruitment of new faculty and staff.

5. Negotiate the appointment of faculty and staff positions.

6. Administer University tenure and promotion policies as they relate to the Department. In consultation with the Executive Committee, appoint ad hoc committees to conduct promotion and tenure reviews in accordance with the procedures described in Appendix A.

7. In consultation with the Executive Committee, appoint ad hoc committees to conduct third year reviews in accordance with the procedures described in Appendix G.

8. Oversee hiring, performance, and evaluation of the office support staff. Solicit faculty input as part of annual evaluation of support staff.

e. Overseeing Department budget responsibilities:

1. Make department budget available for faculty review at least once each semester.

2. Solicit faculty input before revising budget allocations should the Department's financial situation change significantly.

f. Overseeing the Department's Alumni Advisory Board.

B. Associate Chair

1. Any tenured Regular Faculty member is eligible to serve as Associate Chair.
2. The Associate Chair will normally serve a three-year term, renewable once.
3. Selection of the Associate Chair should involve both the faculty and the Department Chair. A ballot shall be prepared containing the names of those faculty members interested in the position. Each member of the Regular Faculty may vote for one of these candidates. The results of this vote shall be reported to the Chair, and s/he shall choose an Associate Chair from among the two candidates who have received the largest number of votes. Normally the election of the Associate Chair shall occur in the year following that of the Chair.
4. The duties of the Associate Chair are to:
 - a. Work closely with the Department Chair and appropriate committees on policy and administrative matters as they arise and as requested by the Department Chair.
 - b. Plan and schedule all undergraduate classes, including summer school classes, and decide on summer school faculty assignments as well as regular year teaching assignments.
 - c. Work with the Graduate Committee and the Director of Graduate Studies to schedule graduate classes.
 - d. Solicit input from faculty regarding their preferences as to teaching times and course assignments.
 - e. Oversee undergraduate advising. Be available to advise undergraduate students, especially those with difficult curricular problems, and to handle inquiries about majoring in history, including those from visiting high-school students.
 - e. Oversee undergraduate curricular matters.
 - f. Maintain and analyze enrollment figures and report them to the Department.
 - g. Maintain and analyze teaching load reports.
 - h. Network with the Registrars' Office and with other appropriate university and college officials.
 - i. Serve, when asked, in place of the Chair at such functions as Department Heads' meetings.

j. Exercise authority to approve all official documents in the absence of the Department Chair.

k. Provide records to authorized persons in University Honors and in such honor societies as Phi Alpha Theta and Phi Beta Kappa.

l. Conduct exit interviews with graduating history majors and report results to the Department.

m. Oversee the competition for departmental student awards, such as the History Prize.

5. The Associate Chair shall receive

a. A supplement to the regular nine-month salary.

b. A one-course teaching-load reduction each semester.

c. Guarantee of a summer school teaching or orientation position.

C. Director of Graduate Studies

1. Any tenured Faculty member is eligible to serve as Director of Graduate Studies.

2. The Director of Graduate Studies will normally serve a three-year term, renewable once.

3. Selection of the Director of Graduate Studies should involve both the faculty and the Department Chair. A ballot shall be prepared containing the names of those faculty members interested in the position. Each member of the Regular Faculty may vote for one of these candidates. The results of this vote shall be reported to the Chair, and s/he shall choose a Director of Graduate Studies from among the two candidates who have received the largest number of votes. Normally the election of the Director of Graduate Studies shall occur in the year following that of Associate Chair.

4. The primary duties of the Director are to chair the Graduate Committee and oversee the graduate program (see Appendix J).

5. The Director of Graduate Studies shall receive a teaching release of one course per year.

D. Standing Committees

1. Committees are at the heart of departmental governance, and Regular Faculty are expected to serve upon them when called upon by their colleagues. Failure to do so may be reflected in annual evaluations.

2. Committees are expected to meet regularly during the academic year and report to the Department

- a. Unless temporarily closed by 2/3 vote of the committee, meetings of all Department committees except the Executive Committee are open to any interested faculty (see E, 6, b).
- b. Committee meetings will be announced by the chair of the committee in a timely fashion on the Department's listserv.
- c. If this Handbook does not explicitly provide guidelines for the conduct of the committee's business, Department committees are free to formulate rules for the conduct of business.

3. The Department has seven standing committees: Executive Committee (which is also the Department's Personnel Committee); Computer Committee; Graduate Committee; Outreach and Publicity; Committee; Research Committee; Teaching Review Committee; and Undergraduate Committee.

4. Members of the Executive Committee, the Research Committee, and the Teaching Review Committee are elected by the Regular Faculty. Members of other committees are appointed according to faculty preference and Department need.

5. The Department's committee structure also includes a number of other committees and positions. The responsibilities of these committees and positions are outlined in Appendix J.

E. Executive Committee

1. Membership: The Executive Committee is composed of seven elected members: six tenured faculty and one untenured (if one is available and eligible). The Department Chair is an ex officio, non-voting member of the Executive Committee.

2. Terms: Tenured faculty are normally elected to the Executive Committee for a two-year term, renewable once, and may not serve three consecutive full terms. If, however, an individual serves one year as a replacement member of the Executive Committee, s/he may be re-elected to two, two-year terms. Untenured faculty are normally elected to the Executive Committee for a one-year term, renewable once.

- a. Elections are staggered so that normally three tenured members are elected each year.

- b. An untenured member may not serve on the executive committee during the year in which the candidate is considered for promotion and tenure.

- c. Faculty who go on leave must resign from the Executive Committee for the remainder of his/her term. Vacated seats will be filled by special elections.

- d. The term for the Executive Committee will begin each year on August 10.

3. Duties and Responsibilities of the Executive Committee

- a. Deliberate fundamental policy matters brought before the committee by any faculty member, by the Department Chair, or by the staff.
- b. Bring policy recommendations before the full Department for approval.
- c. Serve as representatives of the History Department faculty in instances when the Chair finds it impossible or inconvenient to call a department meeting.
- d. Serve as the History Department Personnel Committee
 1. Discuss and recommend to the department for final approval any changes in criteria for awarding tenure and promotion.
 2. Review all Promotion and Tenure cases and make recommendations to the Department Chair.
 3. An untenured member of the Executive Committee will not participate in deliberations concerning promotion and tenure.
 4. Oversee the third year review of teaching, research, and service, of untenured members of the Regular Faculty.
- e. Evaluate annually all Regular Faculty of the Department (except the Chair and those faculty holding special appointments) for purposes of merit pay increases and post-tenure review. The Department Chair shall participate, but not vote, in these evaluations.
 1. Report in writing to the Chair the results of these evaluations.
 2. Maintain a written record of the criteria used for evaluations.
 3. Meet with the Chair to discuss changes made to Executive Committee evaluations.
- f. Maintain and update the History Department Faculty Handbook, including making it accessible on the History Department web site.

4. Election Process

- a. By March 1 of each year, the Chair requests each faculty member to indicate his or her willingness to stand for election.
- b. A ballot is prepared and the regular faculty vote for as many candidates as there are slots to be filled on the Executive Committee.
- c. Candidates with the most votes exceeding a majority of the ballots cast will be declared elected.

- d. If the slots are not all filled after the first ballot, a second ballot will be prepared.
 - 1. The number of candidates appearing on this ballot will be limited to twice the number of slots remaining to be filled.
 - 2. The candidates on the second ballot will be those who received the highest plurality on the first ballot.
 - 3. If a tie vote creates more than twice as many candidates as vacancies, the names of all persons receiving the tie vote will be placed on the second ballot.
- e. Faculty will again vote for as many candidates as there are slots still to be filled.
- f. The candidate(s) with the highest number of votes will be elected.

5. Governance Structure of the Executive Committee

- a. At the first meeting of the committee, the elected members will choose a Convener or Co-conveners who will serve for the year.

b. Responsibilities of the Conveners

- 1. Prepare a written agenda for meetings and circulate it to the Department.
- 2. Schedule times and rooms for meetings.
- 3. Preside at meetings.
- 4. Take minutes, submit them to the Executive Committee for approval, and provide approved minutes to the Department Chair for a permanent confidential record.
- 5. Draft a summary of the meeting, to be submitted to committee members for approval, distributed in a timely fashion to the department as a whole, and kept on file in the History Department.
- 6. Keep written notes on annual evaluation of faculty and supply them to the Department Chair.

6. Meetings

- a. Normally the Executive Committee will meet once each full month during the academic year. Any member of the Executive Committee or the Department Chair may call for additional meetings.
- b. Normally meetings of the Executive Committee will be closed. A vote of two-thirds of the members is required to allow others to participate.

- c. Non-members who attend Executive Committee meetings will have no vote.
- d. Faculty who are not members of the committee may bring business before the Executive Committee through a request to the Department Chair or any member of the Executive Committee.

7. Confidentiality

- a. The Executive Committee deals with sensitive promotion and personnel issues and members of the committee are required to observe strict confidentiality in these matters.
- b. Summaries of Executive Committee meetings will not include confidential information.

III. Amendments

- A. The provisions of this Handbook and any amendments to it shall become operative upon approval by an absolute majority of the regular faculty of the Department of History.
- B. Proposed amendments to this Handbook must be circulated in writing to all members of the Regular Faculty at least one week prior to the meeting at which they are to be discussed. A good faith effort will be made to provide copies of proposed amendments to faculty on leave.

Appendix A

EVALUATIONS FOR REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND ANNUAL REVIEW

I. Preamble

This document constitutes an attempt to establish guidelines in the Department of History for evaluating faculty performance in the following areas: Promotion to tenured associate professor and full professor, reappointment to tenure-track appointments, and annual merit pay increases. These guidelines are not to be considered hard and fast rules. Rather, they provide a general indication of what is expected. We anticipate that certain individuals would be rewarded due to exceptional performance in any area of faculty responsibility even if their credentials do not exactly follow these guidelines. On the other hand, we cannot assure candidates that possession of the credentials described in these guidelines will guarantee a favorable evaluation from the Department, College, or University.

The University has set goals of fostering increased, balanced contributions to society in the areas of teaching, research, and service, and expectations may change in one or more of these areas in the future. Thus these guidelines do not constitute a simple checklist of criteria that must be attained for successful evaluations. Nevertheless, we expect that these guidelines will be useful to faculty members preparing for mandatory and optional reviews of performance. We hope they will also be of value in the development of an agreed upon definition of scholarship that incorporates the advancement, integration, and application of knowledge through each of the three missions of the University.

II. General Statement of the Three Missions

A. Instruction

Consistent with University policy, the History Department considers fulfillment of the instructional mission an important factor in the evaluation of faculty. Instructional activities include classroom teaching, advising, and any other activities aimed at improving the learning experience of students.

Effective teaching encompasses the ability to disseminate knowledge, to promote intellectual growth, to develop student skills in conceptualization, critical thinking, and expression. Measurement of effective teaching includes consideration of content; delivery skills, including the ability to create an environment that promotes and facilitates student learning and skills in instructional design, including use of instructional materials, course organization, and appropriate measurement strategies that evaluate student learning.

Advising includes efforts by faculty to provide students with informed and concerned counsel regarding their academic development and future plans.

Other activities related to the instructional mission are:

1. The preparation of new courses or the substantial revision of old ones.

2. The development of new teaching or advising strategies and materials.
3. Participation in University or outside programs designed to improve teaching or advising skills.
4. Special awards or acknowledgments for outstanding teaching or advising.
5. Chairing or serving on thesis committees.
6. Supervision of students in independent studies courses.
7. Publishing in pedagogic journals.

B. Research

Contributions of scholarship and research include work that offers original knowledge and novel interpretations of traditional hypotheses or historical themes; work that aids colleagues in their field; application of historical concepts to other disciplines, and reciprocally, the application of concepts from other fields into history in ways that advance knowledge and scholarship. Common media for scholarly contributions include published books, articles, book chapters, commentaries, book reviews, and the like. Other forms of scholarship that are evaluated include:

- Activities at professional meetings, including paper presentations, formal comments on papers presented by others, and participation in colloquia.
- Funded grant proposals, fellowships, prizes, or other awards that reflect scholarly esteem and reputation.

C. Service

Consistent with University policy, the History Department considers service activities an important factor in the evaluation of faculty for salary, promotion, and tenure or continuing appointment. It is therefore necessary to identify the types of service to be measured and to establish criteria appropriate for our discipline.

Four types of service are commonly cited at Virginia Tech: Public, University, Professional, and Community Service. Difficulties may emerge, however, in classifying and measuring the worth of diverse service activities by historians under these major headings.

All members of the faculty are encouraged and expected to engage in service activities as part of their normal professional life. While it is often difficult to separate service from teaching and research projects, the effort must be made, together with an attempt to determine the value of the contribution. Only in this way will faculty be made aware of service expectations and how the evaluation process works.

Service contributions in the following categories should be noted:

- **PUBLIC SERVICE.** Public service is the practical application of knowledge and skills to problems confronting individual citizens, citizen groups, and public and private organizations. It consists of identifying, assessing, and managing problems, and developing and transferring useful information to relevant "publics."
- **UNIVERSITY SERVICE.** University service is any activity, other than teaching and research, that facilitates the growth and development of the University. It includes the study of Department, College, or University needs, the development of procedures for meeting those needs, and the implementation of those procedures.
- **PROFESSIONAL SERVICE.** Professional service consists of contributions to the advancement of scholarly and professional organizations. These scholarly and professional communities foster communication and cooperative action and play an important role in advancing knowledge within the discipline. Faculty participation promotes individual growth and development and often brings recognition to the University. Professional service includes holding offices, serving on committees, developing programs, editing journals, reviewing grant proposals and manuscripts for press, serving on editorial boards, and assisting colleagues.
- **COMMUNITY SERVICE.** Community service is a personal contribution of effort to community, civic, and religious organizations. While faculty may contribute to these efforts as responsible citizens of the community, they are not considered for the purposes of the annual evaluation. Service to the community that uses professional skills associated with the discipline or the University's interest is considered public or University service.

III. Reappointment to Position of Tenure-Track Assistant Professor

As noted in the University Faculty Handbook (Section 2.9.3), "Faculty members on probationary term appointments should make no presumption of reappointment, including reappointment with tenure. Non-reappointment may be determined by the department head or division director in consultation with the dean and with the advice of a departmental personnel committee or the faculty development committee. The decision may stem from many factors, beyond less than meritorious service, such as modification of programmatic emphasis, enrollment trends, or simply the intention to seek an appointee with superior qualifications or stronger potential for professional development. Should the specification of the reason be helpful for the faculty member's record, the faculty member may request that it be provided in writing." (NOTE: See section 2.7.6.1 of the Faculty Handbook for related information.)

The Executive Committee will advise the Department Chair concerning the reappointment of tenure-track faculty. Prior to its deliberations and recommendation, the Executive Committee will conduct a Third-Year Review. (See Department Handbook, sec. III.D.1.e and Appendix G.) Probationary faculty should make no presumption about a recommendation for reappointment, even less should they make a presumption concerning tenure.

A. Instruction

Expectations of teaching for reappointment will be similar to those outlined below for appointment with tenure. The Department will seek evidence that the faculty member is demonstrating strength in teaching.

B. Research

Reappointment on a tenure-track position should occur after the Department Chair has determined that the candidate has made satisfactory progress toward appointment with tenure after his/her designated probationary period. The Chair should confer with the candidate and be convinced that the candidate's schedule of activities and record to date is suggestive of a successful tenure case. While the Chair cannot be expected to anticipate all the concerns of the evaluation committees set up by the Department, College, and University, he/she should consider the candidate's pace of research and publication, the likelihood that he/she will publish a book by the tenure review date, and the generation of other evidence of demonstrable scholarly acclaim.

C. Service

The tenure-track professor must not be overburdened with service assignments. A reasonable amount of service is expected, however, to supply opportunity for professional development and to provide evidence of a person's ability to work with others and handle an important element of the University's mission. Successful completion of assignments on one or two Department committees each year will be considered reasonable as a standard for reappointment. The number of assignments depends on the Department Chair's estimate of the time requirements of the tasks to be performed by committee members.

IV. Appointment with Tenure

A grant of tenure is the anticipated goal of all untenured persons with a full-time regular faculty appointment. These guidelines are designed to assist such members of the Department in attaining tenure. Reflecting evaluation procedures described in the University Faculty Handbook, candidates for tenure in the Department of History will be evaluated on the basis of research, instruction, and service. Although not all candidates can be expected to have equal levels of commitment in each mission, a high level of general competence is expected, given the need for flexibility in the future establishment of priorities in academic programs. Beyond this basic foundation of competence, decisions will be significantly influenced by signs of genuine excellence in one or two areas. Should the candidate's strength be focused in only one of these missions, the documentation and evaluation should reflect some significant impact of the candidate's contributions beyond the borders of the University. In determining whether tenure should be offered, a demonstrated record of contributions throughout one's academic career will carry a great amount of weight.

Although in some years more than one faculty member might undergo review for promotion, each member will be evaluated solely on the merits of his/her case.

A. Instruction

Successful candidates for tenure should demonstrate effectiveness in the classroom and in other activities related to the instructional mission. In assessing teaching effectiveness, the results of numerical student evaluations should place the candidate within a range of scores in line with Department norms or demonstrate a consistent pattern of improvement. Committees evaluating these scores will compare student ratings based on the size of the class and its academic level. Peer evaluations should be generally favorable and may be considered more important than student ratings. When legitimate criticisms are raised in evaluations, candidates should demonstrate improvement in those areas in succeeding years.

Other evidence of instructional effectiveness will be considered and should be documented for personnel files. These include:

1. Chairing and membership on thesis committees.
2. Development of special teaching materials and the presentation of new teaching methods to people outside the Department and University.
3. Preparation of new courses or substantial revision of old courses.
4. Teaching or advising awards.
5. Participation in workshops or programs designed to develop teaching skills and curricular or pedagogical innovation.
6. Publications dealing with teaching methods in history or enhancing classroom instruction.
7. Presentations in classes other than one's own.
8. Academic advising activities such as service as an advisor to undergraduate or graduate students in planning their academic programs and career goals.
9. Supervision of students in independent studies courses.

B. Research

Tenure-track members of the Department are expected to engage in scholarly research that will lead to significant contributions to their field. Past guidelines and experience in this Department suggest that a record of scholarly publication is of special importance in the attainment of tenure. Normally, this record would include the following evidence:

- A book-length monograph. Actual publication of a book-length monograph is preferred, but something less will be considered. For example, page proofs, production schedules, unconditional contracts, and even conditional contracts will be considered, though each will be given progressively less value. In exceptional cases, critical editions or a series of substantial articles in refereed journals of recognized quality that have made a significant impact in one's field as demonstrated by frequent citation and reference in other historical literature may also be considered acceptable for tenure.

- Substantial evidence that the candidate has begun scholarly research on another project that will lead to continued productivity and publications. Such evidence can include publications in professional journals; fellowships and funded grant proposals; and conference papers.

To assess the quality of scholarly contributions, the Department will consider:

1. Confidential letters of evaluation of scholarly research from outside referees.
2. The quality of the publisher of contributions. While subjective, this evaluation needs to be made, at least when other evidence of acceptance by the academic community is scant. For example, non-refereed journals, journals that have high acceptance rates, and book publishers that print largely unrevised dissertation manuscripts will not be judged as highly as will well-known commercial or university presses and journals that have stringent standards for internal and external review.
3. Reviews of published and unpublished work.
4. Citations in other published works.
5. Other evidence that the candidate's work has won favorable response from his/her peers.

C. Service

In view of this Land Grant University's wide-ranging missions, the successful candidate for tenure should demonstrate skills contributing to the day-to-day operations and betterment of the Department and University as well as to public and professional service. Such contributions might include:

1. Service on Department, College, and University committees.
2. Service as a faculty advisor to student organizations.
3. Service to non-student University organizations.
4. Contributions to University publications.
5. Presentations to secondary school classes.
6. Participation in Department, College, and University outreach programs and activities.
7. Activities in professional organizations.

V. Promotion to Full Professor

A. Instruction

Candidates for promotion to full professor should be able to demonstrate effective teaching and involvement in other instructional activities. In addition to satisfying the same criteria as for promotion to associate professor, successful candidates for promotion to full professor should also have a record of student and peer evaluations of their courses since the last promotion. Other examples of instructional activity will also be considered favorably, such as new courses, reorganization of old courses, application of innovative techniques, directing of graduate theses, advising, pedagogic publications, and any other evidence that the candidate wishes to submit as evidence of commitment to the instructional mission.

B. Research

Promotion to full professor should result after a candidate has demonstrated scholarly activities beyond those that contributed to his/her successful tenure case. The candidate should have established himself or herself with a record as a scholar of national or international distinction. Normally, this record would include the following evidence:

- Two book-length monographs in print by 1 December of the year of review.
- Substantial evidence that the candidate has begun scholarly research on another project that will lead to publications and continued productivity. Such evidence can include publications in professional journals; fellowships and funded grant proposals; and conference papers.

In all cases, the Department will solicit confidential letters of evaluation on the total body of a candidate's scholarship.

C. Service

A full professor will be expected to provide greater service to the University community as a result of increased experience, maturity, and expertise acquired during his/her longer residence at the University. The promise of such contributions must be evidenced by a record of service activities such as those listed above. Moreover, it is expected that, commensurate with the higher position the candidate hopes to attain, he/she will have gained more experience in several of the various areas. Perhaps, for example, the candidate will have won recognition in service by being appointed to higher-level college and University committees and by being appointed to committees of professional societies.

VI. Annual Review for Merit Pay Increases

Consistent with the overall importance of the three missions of the University, reviews for merit pay increases must weigh the various contributions made by faculty members. This exercise is necessary because, unlike evaluations for tenure or promotion, merit pay reviews result in a quantitative result—salary determinations. The Department has adopted the general rule that research performance will be evaluated with a weight of 40 percent; instructional contributions, 40 percent; and service, 20 percent. (Undergraduate advising spans categories and will be credited under both instruction and service; this dual credit applies to members of the Advising Committee, including the member assigned as Liaison with the College of Human Resources and Education.)

Yet the Department must be flexible in using this weighting system. For example, unusual accomplishments in one of the areas, such as a teaching award or publication prize, can be rewarded beyond the measures noted above. While this system means that some sense of arbitrary weighting will remain, it nevertheless seems fair as well as feasible. Moreover, it puts much of the burden of responsibility on the individual faculty member, whose duty it is to submit accurate and sufficient information on his/her FAR and to supplement the report with documentation that demonstrates unusually significant contributions or achievements.

A. Instruction

Evidence of instructional effectiveness must be provided for annual merit pay evaluations. Instructors must have at least one of their courses evaluated by students each semester and accurately record the results on the FAR. The Executive Committee and Chair will consider the reported values in light of Department norms for comparable courses in size and academic level. An instructor's failure to provide verifiable evidence of student evaluations will lead to an evaluation of teaching as below what is normally expected. Executive Committee members might choose to credit only those courses that have been evaluated.

Additional evidence of teaching effectiveness appropriate to rank and stage of career, as indicated in the guidelines for assistant and full professors herein, will also be considered. While not required, it is suggested that all members of the Department request peer evaluation of teaching at least once every three or four years in order to provide useful information to the faculty member and the Department. In all cases of promotion the faculty member should consult with the Chair and the Teaching Review Committee concerning the need for more frequent reviews.

Evidence of meaningful participation in other instructional functions (as listed in section II.A of this appendix)—especially student advising—will also be part of the evaluation process for merit pay increases.

If a member of the Department receives a teaching award, he/she will automatically receive an evaluation of "much above average" (High) in the teaching category for that reporting year. There will, however, be no automatic carry-over to the next year.

B. Research

While solid evidence of achievement is an important factor in the annual evaluation leading to salary adjustment, such evidence cannot be culled entirely from the year itself. Individual projects have their own timetables, and the Department Chair must be prepared to view any single year in the context of the faculty member's total progress over the previous few years. To do otherwise would encourage concentration on quantity at the expense of quality.

Nevertheless, it is important for the faculty member to recognize that he/she operates within a system that demands such yearly evaluation and that it will in fact be based on evidence of achievement. Thus, elementary prudence suggests that he/she aim for the highest level of concrete yearly achievement consistent with high standards of quality. Department members involved in long-term projects like monographs or critical editions may find it advisable to combine this activity with the more limited achievement demonstrated by the publication of

articles; publication of book reviews; participation in professional meetings (delivering papers, commenting, panel membership); or successful competition for grants.

The various forms of contributions to the profession will all be considered, although they will normally be given different degrees of importance. Monographs and book-length critical editions, for example, will be given more weight than books of essays by others in which the faculty member functions as editor, and articles will be credited less than books but more than conference papers or lengthy book reviews.

Faculty must take care that they give appropriate indications of activity during the reporting year as well as in their annual vitas. Service notes are not research, for example. Items that are not yet "in press" must not be so indicated, nor may reference entries that have long languished at a publishing house be listed as though they represented that year's activity.

Recognizing that books and monograph projects require long-term commitments of time that may not lead to intermediate results, the Department will reward faculty members for more than one year once such a major publication is printed. As has been custom in the Department, therefore, the faculty member will be rewarded during the year of the publication with a minimum evaluation of "much above average" (High) as part of his/her research contribution. In the year following publication, the faculty member will be rewarded with a minimum evaluation of "above average" (High/Normal), and during the second year following publication, he/she will receive a minimum evaluation of "average" (Normal). This period of three years rewards the member (at least partially) while he/she works on another major project.

Other professional activities, such as the publication of articles or the presentation of papers, will be recognized in annual evaluations only in the reporting year in which they are made. They have no automatic carry-over value in future years.

C. Service

Reflecting the emphasis on the service mission at Virginia Tech, all members of the faculty should be actively involved in service commitments as a normal part of their professional life. Although such commitments naturally vary according to individual preference and priorities, they should represent more than mere perfunctory participation. As indicated in the general statement on service, the three categories of public, University, and professional service will be considered at the time of annual evaluations.

While some contributions of time and energy, such as membership on an active Department committee, are reasonably self-evident, others, such as participation in a professional organization or participating in the editorial process of journals and presses (manuscript readings, service on editorial boards) often require explanation. Therefore, faculty should (wherever appropriate) briefly clarify service contributions not readily discernible as well as those of special importance during the reporting year under evaluation.

D. The annual evaluation process.

Each year each Department faculty member supplies the Department Chair a Faculty Activities Report (FAR) and a current vita. The Chair sees that copies of each FAR and vita go to each

member of the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee collectively evaluates each Department member's activities for that reporting year and reports the results to the Departmental Chair. Each evaluation contains a ranking of High, High/Normal, Normal, Low/Normal, or Low for overall performance and for each component category: Teaching (normally 40 percent), research (normally 40 percent), and service (normally 20 percent). The Chair reviews the Executive Committee's recommendations, usually accepting the rankings but free to make adjustments in particular cases—adjustments that the Chair reports back to the Executive Committee. After adding written comments for each category, the Chair shares each appraisal with the individual faculty member. Finally, the Chair makes recommendations, based on these rankings, to the Dean for merit increases in salary.

Appendix B

PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING

I. PROCEDURES

1. Teaching evaluation of individual faculty will be conducted by an Ad Hoc Teaching Review Committee. It will be composed of three members, two appointed from the committee by the chair of the Department's Teaching Review Committee and a third person selected by the Department Chair after consultation with the professor being reviewed.
2. A faculty member wishing to have his/her classes evaluated will give the Teaching Review Committee at least three weeks advance notice.
3. Once constituted, the Ad Hoc Teaching Review Committee will meet with the professor in order to determine the number, course level, and time of visits.
4. This committee will examine normal classroom materials such as syllabi, handouts, assignments, quizzes, and examinations. The instructor is free to make additional relevant material available to the Ad Hoc Committee.
5. At the conclusion of their classroom visits each member of the Ad Hoc Committee will write a report to the Department Chair and give a copy to the instructor. These reports should address perceived strengths, perceived weaknesses, and recommendations for improvement, all with regard to class preparation, presentation, substance, and class dynamics when appropriate. The reports should specifically address issues raised in any previous reviews.
6. At the discretion of the person being evaluated, after the reports have been submitted, the Ad Hoc Committee shall arrange to meet with the instructor, go over the reports point by point, and answer any matters brought up by the instructor. The purpose of the meeting is to clarify issues raised in the reports and to assist the instructor in improving his/her teaching by making recommendations on how to cope with weak points and how to take advantage of strong ones.
7. The instructor may respond to the reports either verbally or in writing. A written response becomes part of the teaching evaluation file.

II. FREQUENCY OF REVIEWS

1. All Faculty:

When faculty members wish to have their classes reviewed for the purpose of improving their teaching, they should so inform the Department Chair and the chair of the Department Teaching Review Committee and arrange to have the evaluation process conducted. There is no requirement that anybody participate in this process EXCEPT in the two cases that follow.

2. **Untenured tenure-track faculty:**
Such faculty will be evaluated by these procedures in the second, third, and fifth years of their tenure-track service. In addition, there will be an informal evaluation of such faculty in their first year of service by a member of the faculty chosen by the instructor in consultation with the Department Chair; such evaluation will not become part of the faculty member's teaching evaluation file. In instances in which untenured faculty wish to be considered for early tenure and promotion, they must arrange to be reviewed during the academic year prior to the one in which they want to have their tenure cases considered.

3. **Associate Professors:**

Similar documentation is also mandatory in cases of promotion to the rank of Professor. Whenever associate professors are nearing consideration for such promotion they should so inform the Department Chair and the chair of the Teaching Review Committee and arrange a review. This must be done in sufficient time to allow the committee to conduct the review and prepare their reports for the Department Chair and to permit all the associate professor's promotion committee members to consider them.

III. USES OF THE REPORTS

1. Reports are confidential, available only to the instructor and the Department Chair, except under the conditions stipulated below.
 - In the academic year in which they are written, their normal use is to inform instructors about how their peers regard the effectiveness of their teaching and to aid them in improving their classroom performance.
 - Later, the more recent sets of reports are to be made available to subsequent review committees before they visit classes, so that they may address issues raised in previous reports.
 - Reports will be made available to committees charged with evaluating faculty for third-year review, promotion and tenure, promotion to full professor, or post-tenure review.
2. These reports are not to be used by the Executive Committee as it makes its annual evaluations and recommendations regarding merit pay increase.
3. These reports may be used for other purposes only with the written consent of the faculty member evaluated.

Appendix C

PROCEDURE FOR SELECTING A DEPARTMENT CHAIR

Term: 3 years.

Eligibility: All Tenured Faculty.

Renewal: The Department Chair can serve a maximum of two consecutive terms. At the end of his/her first term, the current Chair can choose not to be among the candidates for the next election. If elected to a second consecutive term, he/she cannot be among the candidates for the following election.

If an incumbent Chair decides to seek a second term, the Executive Committee will prepare a ballot with the option of yes, favoring a second term, or no, opposing a second term, and distribute it to all Regular Faculty and full-time office staff. Should the incumbent receive yes votes on ballots from 2/3 of the eligible voters, the Dean shall be informed of the department's decision. Should the incumbent fail to receive that proportion of the votes, then the Executive Committee will initiate the procedure described below, and the incumbent Chair may choose to be a candidate.

Time of Election: Normally during fall semester of the present Chair's final year in office. Should the present Chair find it necessary to resign before the three-year term is completed, the Executive Committee will initiate the selection process as soon as the Department is informed of the impending vacancy.

Voting: Round 1

The Executive Committee will draw up a ballot containing the names of all eligible candidates. The ballot will be submitted to all Regular Faculty and full-time office staff.

Faculty and staff will return ballots after selecting the names of three candidates in order of preference. In order to be counted, a ballot must include three names given in order of preference.

The Executive Committee will count the ballots, assigning a score of 3 for each first choice selection, 2 for each second choice, 1 for each third choice.

The Executive Committee will identify the three candidates with the highest scores. If tie scores prevent the identification of only three top candidates, the number will be expanded accordingly. These three or more will be asked if they wish to remain candidates. If fewer than three are willing to do so, their places will be taken by those with the next highest scores. The process will continue until the committee can produce at least three willing candidates or until all eligible candidates have been invited to serve. If at that stage there are still fewer than three candidates, the next ballot will contain only that number.

These candidates will make presentations to the Department.

Voting: Round 2

Another ballot containing only these candidates will be submitted to all Department faculty and full-time staff, who will return it after selecting the names of three candidates (if the ballot contains at least three names, otherwise as many names as are on the ballot) in order of preference. In order to be counted, a ballot must include three names (again, if the ballot contains at least three names) given in order of preference.

The Executive Committee will count ballots, assigning a score of 3 for each first choice selection, 2 for each second choice, 1 for each third choice.

The Executive Committee will identify the candidates with the top two scores, then prepare a ballot with just those two names.

In case of a tie for second place, a run-off election will be held involving only those candidates involved in the tie.

If, however, any candidate receives first-place votes from $\frac{2}{3}$ or more of the total vote cast in this round, that candidate's name will be submitted to the Dean as the Department's choice.

Voting: Round 3

If necessary, a final ballot containing only the names of the two finalists will be submitted to regular Department faculty and full-time staff, who will return it after selecting the name of one candidate.

If either candidate receives $\frac{2}{3}$ or more of the total vote cast, that candidate's name will be submitted to the Dean as the Department's choice.

If neither candidate receives $\frac{2}{3}$ or more of the total vote cast, the Department will be informed of the vote and asked to vote again with the hope that the candidate with a majority of votes can pick up at least $\frac{2}{3}$.

If neither candidate obtains $\frac{2}{3}$ on this ballot, the names of both candidates will be submitted to the Dean, together with the tally.

Appendix D

ALLOCATION OF DEPARTMENT RESEARCH FUNDS

The History Department normally makes available each year a sum of money to support faculty research projects. The process for awarding funds is a competitive one. It is the responsibility of the Department Research Committee to collect and evaluate proposals and make recommendations to the Department Chair whose responsibility it is to distribute department research funds.

A. Eligibility – All Regular Faculty are eligible to apply for department research grants. Visiting assistant professors and part-time instructors may apply to the Department Chair for research funds.

B. Preference –

1. Primary preference for awards will be given to untenured faculty.
2. Secondary preference will be given to associate professors.

C. Support may be requested for any aspect of the research or publication process.

D. Procedure for Applying for Department Research Funds

1. The Research Committee will solicit applications early in the fall semester.
2. Applicants should submit a concise proposal with a budget conforming to state guidelines.

E. Awards Guide

1. Applicants may normally receive no more than 15 percent of the total amount of available funds in a given year.
2. Untenured faculty who submit an acceptable application will normally receive the full amount requested up to a maximum of 15 percent of the total amount of available funds in a given year.
3. Applicants should specify direct links between Department funds received in recent years and completed research, preferably in published form.

F. Announcement of Awards: The recipients of awards will be announced by the Department Chair.

Appendix E

FLEXIBLE TEACHING AGREEMENTS

I. Preamble

1. The normal expectation for faculty in the Department of History is that they will contribute to the Department's three missions of instruction, research and scholarship, and service. The relative importance attached to each of these areas of responsibility and the anticipated demand on a faculty member's time are reflected in the weights given to these areas in annual faculty evaluations. As stated in Appendix A (Sec. VI), "The Department has adopted the general rule that research performance will be evaluated with a weight of 40 percent; instructional contributions, 40 percent; and service, 20 percent."
2. As this formula indicates, the Department of History expects faculty to give approximately equal time and effort to their instructional and research responsibilities. The Department recognizes however, that there may be instances when its interests would be better served by an increase in a faculty member's instructional responsibilities so long as the Department's aggregate responsibilities to the mission of the University are carried out. Similarly, there are many times in a faculty member's professional life when a different mix of responsibilities seems preferable. Such an alternative mix – referred to in these Guidelines as a "Flexible Teaching Agreement" (FTA) – might be appropriate for faculty who wish to reduce their emphasis on research (at least in the coming calendar year) and enhance their teaching responsibilities. Similarly, it might be appropriate for faculty who have maintained a high level of excellence in teaching but who have not done so in research and scholarly productivity. The differences in responsibilities for a faculty member on an FTA would be reflected in the weights given for purposes of annual evaluation to instruction and to research and publication.

II. Guidelines and Expectations

1. Any appointment to an FTA will be for one calendar year at a time. This schedule is calibrated to the current reporting year for Faculty Activity Reports, in which instructional activities are reported on a calendar year basis, not the academic year.
2. Tenured members of the Regular Faculty are eligible for FTAs. Tenure-track faculty are not eligible.
3. There will be no set number of faculty on FTAs during any calendar year.
4. To give the Departmental scheduler sufficient time to plan the next calendar year's courses, an individual desiring to take on an FTA should inform the Associate Chair, in writing, by the end of March each year. It will be assumed that, absent such notification from any faculty member, that he/she does not wish to be on an FTA that next year.

5. The teaching load of faculty on FTAs will be five, six, seven, or eight courses in a calendar year -- that is either one or two additional courses each year or even each semester -- to be determined by the faculty member in consultation with the Associate Chair.
6. For purposes of annual evaluation, the weights given to instruction, research, and service will be as follows:
 - for faculty teaching five courses in a calendar year, 50 percent for instruction, 30 percent for research and scholarship, and 20 percent for service.
 - for faculty teaching six courses in a calendar year, 60 percent for instruction, 20 percent for research and scholarship, and 20 percent for service.
 - for faculty teaching seven courses in a calendar year, 70 percent for instruction, 10 percent for research and scholarship, and 20 percent for service.
 - for faculty teaching eight courses in a calendar year, 80 percent for instruction, 0 percent for research and scholarship, and 20 percent for service.

Appendix F

TENURE-TRACK RESEARCH RELEASE

In order to provide support for junior faculty during a critical stage in their research and to help them strengthen their case for promotion and tenure, the History Department shall grant all tenure track faculty one semester of paid release time from all teaching and service obligations. This semester release shall be taken sometime between the second and fifth year of appointment in the department, with the exact date being determined by the faculty member in consultation with the department chair and associate chair. Faculty whose third-year review leads to a recommendation of nonrenewal of contract shall not be eligible for this release time. Release requests granted under this policy should be made as far in advance as possible, but normally no later than 1 February for releases to be held the following fall term and 1 October for releases to be held the following spring term. The period of release time granted under this policy will count in determining the faculty member's term of service to the university for mandatory tenure and promotion review as well as university-sponsored research and study leaves.

Faculty granted release time under this policy:

- are encouraged to seek grants, fellowships, and other means of internal and external support to extend their leave beyond one semester
- remain eligible to compete for departmental research and travel funds
- are not required to remain in residence during the period of their release time
- may not hold a teaching assignment at this or any other institution during the semester they have been granted release time
- are expected to return to their regular faculty responsibilities at Virginia Tech at the end of their release time

Appendix G

THIRD-YEAR REVIEW

I. Preamble

The History Department Faculty Handbook stipulates that faculty members on probationary-term appointments will undergo a comprehensive review of their progress toward tenure in their third academic year at Virginia Tech. The purpose of the review is to determine whether a faculty member should be continued through the end of his/her mandatory review year (normally the sixth year of service at Virginia Tech). As stated in the Handbook (Sec. III.D.1.e.): “These third-year reviews should provide the basis for the Executive Committee’s recommendation, and the Chair’s decision, whether to renew the contracts of tenure-track junior faculty prior to the mandatory tenure review, although other information may play a role as well.”

A final copy of the report will go to the Chair, but these reviews are not to be made part of a faculty member's tenure file. They are intended for the use of the Executive Committee, the Chair, and the candidate only.

The rationale behind the third year review is that, by their third year at Virginia Tech, tenure-track faculty should have established enough of a record in the three areas of teaching, research, and service to indicate the likelihood of a favorable recommendation for tenure by the Department's Executive Committee and Chair. Conversely, the History Department believes that it serves neither the Department's interest nor that of a tenure-track faculty member to continue that person through his/her mandatory review when he/she seems unlikely, based on the third-year review, to receive a favorable tenure recommendation.

The Guidelines for Third Year Review also rest on the following premises:

- The entire review process is intended to be constructive and helpful. The emphasis is on the promise of a person receiving a favorable tenure recommendation rather than on reasons for dismissal of that person prior to his/her mandatory review year. Indeed, a favorable tenure decision is always the Department’s expectation for people offered tenure-track positions.
- Since the emphasis is on the promise rather than the certainty of a person receiving a favorable tenure recommendation in his/her mandatory review year, that person will not be expected by the time of the third-year review to have established a record sufficient to warrant a favorable tenure decision.
- Although in some years more than one faculty member might undergo a third-year review, each member will be evaluated solely on the merits of his/her case.

II. Procedure

The review procedure will be a variation of the procedure used in making tenure recommendations.

1. During the fall semester, the Chair will appoint an ad hoc committee to undertake the review. Normally the committee will consist of three tenured members of the Executive Committee. The ad hoc committee will advise the faculty member about documentation.
2. By 1 February, the faculty member being reviewed will supply the ad hoc committee with materials pertinent to his/her teaching, research and scholarship, and service. Normally the committee will not solicit letters from outside evaluators. If the committee requests outside evaluations of scholarship, it will ask the faculty member to submit a list of persons he/she does not want to serve as evaluators, and the people named will not be asked to submit letters.
3. By 15 March, the ad hoc committee will make its recommendation to the tenured members of the Executive Committee, who will vote by secret ballot, no later than 15 April, on that recommendation. After the ballot, the Executive Committee will forward its recommendation to the Chair with a letter of explanation addressing the Department's three missions as set forth in Appendix A, Section II.
4. If in agreement with the recommendation of the Executive Committee, the Chair will inform the faculty member being reviewed of the decision. If in disagreement with the Executive Committee's recommendation, the Chair will meet with the Committee to discuss the points of disagreement in an effort to reconcile differences. The final decision on renewal nonetheless rests with the Chair, who will inform the faculty member of his/her decision no later than the end of the final examination period for the spring semester.
5. A faculty member being terminated will be given a one-year notice of termination in accordance with Virginia Tech and AAUP guidelines.

III. Expectations

Although it is not possible to state with absolute precision what constitutes "satisfactory progress toward tenure," the following will normally be expected of a faculty member being considered for renewal:

- Instruction. In order of importance: 1) favorable peer evaluations; 2) overall student evaluations that are consistent with Department norms for untenured persons teaching the kind of course (size and level) being evaluated; 3) evidence (such as course syllabi, examinations, and handouts) that the faculty member is satisfactorily promoting, facilitating, and evaluating student learning.
- Research and Scholarship. For a favorable tenure recommendation, the Department normally requires that a book-length manuscript be accepted for publication by a refereed press, and at least be in press, by the time of the mandatory review year and, further, that the candidate have given papers at professional conferences and produced journal articles and other publications. Toward that end, at the time of the third-review, candidates are expected to provide tangible evidence of on-going research and scholarship, e.g., at least

two papers presented at professional meetings and/or publications submitted to refereed journals.

- Service. Evidence of satisfactory performance of committee assignments (although it is understood that departmental policy is to minimize the number of committee assignments for new tenure-track faculty).

Appendix H
POST-TENURE REVIEW POLICIES AND PROCEDURES
and
STATEMENT OF FACULTY OBLIGATIONS AND STANDARDS
DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
Effective 15 August 1997

I. Post-Tenure Review Policies and Procedures

A. General

University Policies and Procedure relating to Unsatisfactory Performance and Post-Tenure Review are contained in Section 2.9 of the University Faculty Handbook [<http://ate.cc.vt.edu/PROVOST/fhb/fhbtoc.html>]; nothing in this section should be interpreted as superseding or abridging those policies. Similarly, nothing in this section should be interpreted as abridging the University's right to proceed directly to dismissal for cause as defined in Section 2.11.1 of the Faculty Handbook, or the right of individual faculty members to pursue existing mechanisms of reconciliation and redress.

During the annual evaluation of faculty, the Department Chair in consultation with the Department Executive Committee may choose to assign to a faculty member an overall rating of "Unsatisfactory." The rating of "Unsatisfactory" is the lowest rating that can be assigned to a faculty member and is defined to mean failure to meet the minimal expectations of the Department of History, as set forth in this document. In particular, an Unsatisfactory rating is not intended to be assigned automatically when a faculty member's performance is deemed to be deficient and in need of improvement in one or more areas, or just because the faculty member's annual evaluation is perhaps the lowest in the Department. In assigning an Unsatisfactory rating, the Executive Committee will prepare a summary of its findings and make a recommendation to the Chair.

As stipulated in Section 2.9.2 of the Faculty Handbook, a faculty member who receives an Unsatisfactory rating by the Department Chair shall be given written notification of that rating and the considerations upon which it is based. The faculty member may respond within thirty days to the stated reasons for the Unsatisfactory rating or may seek redress through either the reconciliation or grievance procedures (see Faculty handbook, 2.12). Indeed, in all cases where the Chair is considering assigning an Unsatisfactory rating or the Executive Committee has recommended an Unsatisfactory rating, the Chair shall notify the faculty member in writing of the perceived deficiencies and their seriousness, and of remedial actions which, if implemented, will correct them.

On a continuing basis, when the Chair places items that may eventually be used to document deficiencies (student complaints, negative letters) in a faculty member's personnel file, the

faculty member shall be afforded the opportunity to respond (verbally and/or in writing) to those items in a manner that is timely and yet respectful of the rights of other individuals involved. If the faculty member chooses to provide a written response, the Chair will also place that response in the individual's personnel file.

The Chair shall inform the Executive Committee of a decision to assign an Unsatisfactory rating to a faculty member. Should the Executive Committee disagree with the Chair's decision to assign an Unsatisfactory rating, the Executive Committee by majority vote may elect to submit its own written report, a copy of which shall be given to the faculty member and a copy of which the Chair shall place in the faculty member's permanent file.

B. The Post-Tenure Review Committee

Whenever a faculty member with tenure receives two consecutive annual evaluations of Unsatisfactory performance, a post-tenure review is mandatory. The review shall be conducted by a Post-Tenure Review (PTR) Committee selected as follows.

1. The Post-Tenure Review Committee shall consist of three members selected from the tenured faculty of the Department of History. When an individual receives two consecutive ratings of Unsatisfactory, no member of the Executive Committee that assigned those ratings may serve on the resulting PTR Committee. Further, no faculty member is to serve simultaneously on the Department Executive Committee and any PTR Committee. The election of a PTR Committee member to the Executive Committee creates a vacancy on the PTR Committee. Faculty excluded from membership on a PTR Committee by virtue of their membership on the Executive Committee are permitted to vote in the election of a PTR Committee.
2. The Department Chair in consultation with the Executive Committee and the faculty member undergoing the review shall initially attempt to identify a panel that is mutually acceptable. If such a panel can be identified and is willing to serve, it shall constitute the Post-Tenure Review Committee. In this event the faculty member undergoing review must waive in writing the right to an elected committee. Such a procedure has the advantage of preserving a measure of privacy and confidentiality. If, however, in the judgment of either the Chair or the faculty member under review, this procedure cannot be successfully implemented, the PTR Committee will be elected by the Department as described in (3) below.
3. The regular faculty of the Department of History will vote by ballot to select candidates from among the eligible tenured faculty for the Post-Tenure Review Committee. A list of the five members of the Department who receive the most votes will be presented to the faculty member under review. In the event of a tie vote for the fifth candidate, a larger list will be presented to the faculty member under review. That faculty member will select three individuals who will constitute the PTR Committee.
4. In the event that a vacancy occurs on an existing Post-Tenure Review Committee, the Department Chair in consultation with the Executive Committee and the faculty member undergoing review shall initially attempt to identify a mutually acceptable replacement for each vacancy. If, in the judgment of either the Department Chair or the faculty member under review, this procedure cannot be successfully implemented, the regular faculty in the

Department of History will vote by ballot to select candidates to fill the existing vacancies. The number of candidates elected will be the number of vacancies plus one and the elected candidates will be those who receive the most votes. In the event that a tie vote prevents election of the exact number of candidates, a larger list of candidates will be presented to the faculty member under review. From the list, the faculty member will select one individual for each vacancy.

C. Conducting the Post-Tenure Review

The Post-Tenure Review Committee shall conduct its review in accordance with the procedures specified in Section 2.9.4 of the Faculty Handbook. Membership on the PTR Committee implies a responsibility to vote on the issues that come before the Committee. A majority vote of the Committee is sufficient to find either (a) that the faculty member's competence and /or professional contributions meet or surpass the Department's minimal expectations, or (b) that the faculty member's competence and/or professional contributions do not meet the Department's minimal expectations and a single period of remediation, not normally to exceed two years, is recommended. A unanimous vote of the PTR Committee is required to recommend a more severe sanction or to recommend dismissal for cause.

University policy stipulates that, following a period of remediation, the Post-Tenure Review Committee will certify satisfactory performance, recommend dismissal for cause, or recommend that a sanction be imposed. A further period of remediation is not an option. A majority vote of the PTR Committee is sufficient to carry its recommendation.

If a faculty member is either under review by a Post-Tenure Review Committee or in a remedial period specified by the Committee, the Executive Committee may continue to evaluate the individual for purpose of salary increases, but further ratings of Unsatisfactory may not be assigned to that individual until the PTR Committee submits its final recommendations.

II. Statement of Faculty Obligations and Standards

A. Introduction

Sections D through F of this document outline the "normal" standards and obligations of the tenured faculty of the Department of History in the areas of Instructional Activities, Research and Scholarly Activity, and Service and Outreach. Nothing in this statement shall be interpreted to supersede or abrogate policies or procedures in the Faculty Handbook. The "normal" standards included in this document, the standards of conduct and ethical behavior as stated in the Faculty Handbook and/or promulgated through other channels, the statement in Section B on failure to meet minimal expectations, and the statement in Section C regarding an Unsatisfactory rating shall provide a basis for the Department Chair in consultation with the Department Executive Committee to assign an annual rating of "Unsatisfactory" to a faculty member.

These standards are not intended and shall not be used to violate the principles of academic freedom nor to discourage the expression of minority opinions, dissent from professional orthodoxies, and/or honest and civil disagreement.

An integral part of the Department's annual evaluation of a faculty member is a consideration of the duties assigned to that faculty member. Unless otherwise informed, faculty in the Department of History are normally expected to dedicate 40 percent of their efforts to instructional activities, 40 percent to research and scholarly activities, and 20 percent to service/outreach. Depending on available resources, departmental needs, changing interests, and the performance of duties, the annual evaluation may result in a reassignment of duties, such as an increase in teaching duties for an individual whose research activity has waned. A reassignment of duties does not typically imply a failure to meet minimal expectations; it typically represents a workload adjustment to better utilize existing skills. It must be emphasized that an evaluation of Unsatisfactory is to be based on the performance of those duties and responsibilities that have been explicitly assigned to the faculty member.

Throughout this document the word deficiency is interpreted to mean a failure to meet normal standards and obligations.

B. Failure to Meet Minimal Expectations

A faculty member fails to meet the minimal expectations of the Department of History in one of the areas of Instructional Activity, Research and Scholarly Activity, and Service and Outreach provided the faculty member has assigned responsibilities in that area and either:

- demonstrates a consistent, serious, and willful disregard of the standards for that area, or
- fails over the course of a reasonable, pre-assigned period of time to remedy identified, serious, and chronic deficiencies in that area.

Further, a faculty member fails to meet minimal expectations in the area of Instructional Activity provided:

- that faculty member's demeanor, policies, presentation of material, or other behavior when teaching so negatively impacts the learning environment that students' performances in the faculty member's classes chronically, consistently, and demonstrably fall substantially below the Department's expectations for students in that course.

C. Unsatisfactory Rating

Before the beginning of each academic year, it is expected that the Department through the action of the Chair or other agency will inform each faculty member of the percentage of total workload to be allocated to each of the three areas of Instructional Activity, Research and Scholarly Activity, and Service and Outreach. Unless specifically informed to the contrary, faculty in the Department of History will be expected to allocate 40 percent of their efforts to Instructional Activity, 40 percent to Research and Scholarly Activity, and 20 percent to Service and Outreach. An overall rating of Unsatisfactory is appropriate when:

1. A faculty member fails to meet minimal expectations in one or more of these three areas, and
2. Those areas in which the faculty member's performance fails to meet minimal expectations comprise the majority of the individual's workload, and

3. When (a) a previous reassignment of duties has not yielded sufficient improvement, or (b) a reassignment of duties would fail to meet the Department's needs or be contrary to departmental policy or offer little expectation of remedying the identified, serious deficiencies.

D. Faculty Standards in Instructional Activities

Before the beginning of each academic year, it is expected that the Department through the action of the Chair or other agency will define the responsibilities of each faculty member in the area of Instructional Activities. As part of this process, the faculty member's expected course load and the percentage of the faculty member total workload devoted to Instructional Activities will be established. In the Department of History unless informed otherwise faculty are expected to devote 40 percent of their workload to teaching. In making instructional assignments, a conscientious effort to balance the abilities and interests of the faculty member against the needs of the Department, College, and University is presupposed.

Faculty with teaching-related duties are expected to exhibit the competence and to maintain the skills necessary to carry out those duties normally assigned. They are further expected to perform those duties in a responsible and professional manner while adhering to departmental and university policies and procedures. (See Faculty Handbook, 4.0.) Specifically, faculty are expected to:

1. Accept assigned duties. This is not intended to prevent faculty from questioning the appropriateness of an assignment. However, once an assignment is determined by the Department Chair in consultation with the faculty member in question—or, if necessary to resolve persistent disagreement, the Executive Committee—to be reasonable and to have been made following proper procedures, the faculty member does not then have the prerogative to refuse the assignment.
2. Provide students in each course with a course syllabus/contract (as described in Faculty Handbook, 4.6.1). In particular, students are to be informed of the expected performance for which grades will be assigned, the instructor's attendance policy (if any), how the Honor System is to be applied, and the prerequisites for the course. The syllabus/contract should also include information about the instructor's office hours and how the instructor can be reached.
3. Meet all syllabus-scheduled classes except for university-wide cancellations, absences sanctioned by the Department and/or University, or absences related to illness or emergencies. When faculty cannot meet a class, it is the faculty's responsibility to follow departmental procedures so that appropriate measures can be taken to deal with the situation.
4. Deliver lectures or conduct the class in a well-prepared, professional, and competent manner.
5. Provide regularly scheduled office hours each week and be available during those times for consultation with students. With reasonable effort a student should be able to confer with the faculty in a timely manner, either at scheduled office hours or by other arrangement.

(See Faculty Handbook, 4.7.1). In applying this standard it must be recognized that other demands on time (professional duties, travel, emergencies) will sometimes conflict with scheduled office hours. On such occasions, faculty should make alternative arrangements with students.

6. Adhere to principles of appropriateness, fairness, and clear communication in the assignment of grades. (See Faculty Handbook, 4.6.)
7. Maintain a good learning environment in the classroom, an environment that is inclusive and accepting of students with regard to race, color, sex, sexual orientation, disability, age, veteran status, national origin, religion, or political affiliation and an environment that promotes mutual respect, honesty, and integrity. (See Faculty Handbook, 4.9.)

E. Faculty Standards in Research and Scholarly Activity

Before the beginning of each academic year, it is expected that the Department through the action of the Department Chair or other agency will define the responsibilities of each faculty member in the area of Research and Scholarly Activity. Typically this will entail specifying any change in the 40/40/20 workload in the Department of History. The individual faculty member is expected to:

1. Pursue scholarly activity in a competent and intellectually honest manner, including appropriate citation of existing, closely related work known to the researcher, and acknowledging substantial contributions from colleagues and/or students.
2. Be visible and active professionally, disseminating the results of research and scholarly activity in an appropriate manner (such as books, articles, and presentations).
3. Make a conscious effort to remain vital and grow intellectually in the chosen area of scholarship.
4. Participate to an appropriate degree and as opportunities arise in the scholarly training of qualified graduate students, assisting them in the pursuit of their professional and degree objectives, and in no way inappropriately taking personal or professional advantage of their efforts. This shall not be construed as discouraging joint publication—for example, of a completed thesis—but is intended rather to emphasize that premature or inappropriate publication, presentation, commercial use, or copyrighting of such work by the supervising faculty member is not acceptable.

F. Faculty Standards in Service and Outreach

Before the beginning of each academic year, it is expected that the Department through the action of the Department Chair or other agency will define the responsibilities of each faculty member in the area of Service and Outreach. Typically this will entail specifying any change in the 40/40/20 workload in the Department of History. In making assignments in the area of Service and Outreach, a conscientious effort to balance the abilities and interests of the faculty member against the needs of the Department, College, and University is presupposed. It is assumed, moreover, that the Department, College, or University has committed itself to providing the faculty member with the information and resources required to discharge the assigned duties effectively.

It is clear that new tasks involving service/outreach and requiring additional, prompt faculty involvement will typically arise during the course of an academic year. Similarly, service assignments may prove to be more burdensome than initially anticipated. It is expected that both the Department administration and individual faculty will exercise prudence and flexibility in making the necessary adjustments to address these matters.

The individual faculty member is expected to:

1. Obtain a clear understanding of the expectations and responsibilities inherent in each assigned duty.
2. Acquire the information and resources needed to perform these duties.
3. Perform the assigned duties in a timely, effective, and collegial manner. Serious difficulties and/or impediments that arise in the performance of these duties must be reported to the Chair or other relevant agency so that the problems can be addressed in a timely manner.
4. Provide in a timely and accurate manner any required documentation or report.

In addition to assigned duties, faculty members are encouraged to pursue activities which provide service to the College, the University, and the profession and as appropriate professional service to the community, the state, and the nation. Such activities will be considered when evaluating the faculty member's service/outreach contributions.

Appendix I

TEACHING LOAD

I. Preamble

Course loads vary at the University and in the Department in view of other teaching, research, and service obligations. Consistent with the objective of promoting excellence in the pursuit of all three missions, the Chair is responsible for setting the Department's teaching load policy.

II. The 2-2 course load

Beginning in the calendar year 2002, the normal teaching load for Regular Faculty (tenured and tenure-track) in the History Department is four courses each year, termed a "2-2" course load, although tenured faculty may choose to teach more.

Exceptions and special situations include:

- For faculty on a Flexible Teaching Agreement (ETA), the teaching load in any given calendar year is more than four courses but no more than eight, per Appendix E.
- For tenure-track faculty, who are working on their research to secure promotion and tenure, a Flexible Teaching Agreement is not an option, so the standard teaching load is the standard four courses per year (2-2).
- For the Department Chair, it is two courses per year (1-1).
- For the Associate Chair, it is also two courses each year (1-1).
- For the Director of Graduate Studies, who gets a course reduction every fourth semester, it is seven courses over two years (2-2-1-2).
- The normal load for full-time visiting faculty is three courses per semester (3-3).
- The teaching load for faculty on joint appointments will be the same as for regular appointments, but with their assignments divided between programs.

III. Implementation

The Department must maintain flexibility in scheduling courses, but faculty will normally teach two courses each term except when they have a course reduction (as with the Chair, Associate Chair, and the Director of Graduate Studies) or take on a Flexible Teaching Agreement.

In view of the variable teaching schedules available to faculty, it is one of the duties of the Associate Chair to keep track of faculty teaching loads in fulfillment of the any divergence from the standard 2-2 expectation.

Appendix J

STANDING COMMITTEES

1. Executive Committee:

Membership and responsibilities of the Executive Committee are described in Section II, E of the Department of History *Faculty Handbook*.

2. Graduate Committee:

It is the responsibility of the Graduate Committee to formulate and enforce policies for the graduate programs in history and area studies. The committee meets monthly, or more often if necessary.

Membership: The Graduate Committee consists of the Director of Graduate Studies, who acts as chair of the committee, the Coordinator of the Area Studies Program, an unspecified number of members of the History Department, and one (or two, if the Area Studies coordinator is a member of the History Department) representative from the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures.

Four members of the Graduate Committee will constitute an Area Studies sub-committee, charged with formulating and enforcing policies specific to students in the Area Studies track and evaluating applicants for admission to the Area Studies Program. This committee will consist of the Director of Graduate Studies, the Area Studies Coordinator, and three additional members, two of whom will be appointed from the Graduate Committee (at least one of whom will be from the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures) and one from the Department of Geography.

The committee will also invite one graduate student to attend meetings and participate in committee discussions.

Responsibilities: The Graduate Committee is responsible for admissions decisions (History and Area Studies), assistantship awards (History and Area Studies), graduate research and travel awards (History and Area Studies), and thesis committee assignments (History and Area Studies).

The Graduate Committee is responsible for maintaining high quality program offerings and to that end the committee is charged with periodically reviewing and revising tracks and courses available to students in the program. The committee is also responsible for the development of new concentrations, and the approval of all new graduate courses.

A member of the Graduate Committee will be appointed as the faculty advisor to the History Graduate Student Association. The faculty advisor's primary responsibility is to help the students organize their annual conference. All members of the Graduate Committee are expected to support the annual graduate student conference and participate in both planning and presentation.

The Graduate Committee will appoint the History Department's liaison to the graduate program in Science and Technology Studies. This individual will ensure course and policy coordination when appropriate and make regular reports to the Graduate Committee.

The Graduate Committee will appoint the History Department's Education Certification liaison. This individual will work with the Department of Teaching and Learning to develop graduate programs for students planning to become history/social studies teachers. The liaison will make regular reports to the Graduate Committee.

In collaboration with the History Department Computer Committee, the Graduate Committee will maintain and regularly update the Graduate Programs website.

The Graduate Committee may be assigned additional tasks as required by the Director of Graduate Studies, the Coordinator of Area Studies, or the Chair of the History Department.

3. Undergraduate Committee:

This Committee shall be concerned with the enrichment of the undergraduate curriculum and with any other matters related to insuring that the Department offers a high quality and wide variety of undergraduate instruction.

The Committee shall consist of a chair, other members of the Faculty appointed annually by the Department Chair, and an undergraduate student selected by the local chapter of Phi Alpha Theta.

The primary duties and responsibilities of this committee shall be to conduct periodic review of the undergraduate curriculum and degree requirements; to make recommendations to the Department for additions, modifications, or deletions in the undergraduate curriculum; and to monitor the College and University core curriculum and requirements insofar as they influence the Department and its students.

Members of the committee, either as individuals or sub-committees, shall also serve to coordinate the policies and actions of the History Department with those of the University Honors Program, Russian Studies, and Interdisciplinary Studies, and one member of the Committee shall serve as faculty adviser to Phi Alpha Theta.

4. Research Committee:

This committee shall consist of five member of the faculty elected on a staggered basis for two-year terms.

The primary duties and responsibilities of this committee shall be to:

- evaluate proposals for Faculty Research Grants and recommend allocation of Department research funds. (See Appendix D)

- review policies with respect to research funds and make appropriate recommendations to the Chair and the Executive Committee.
- recognize excellence in research by nominating candidates for research awards and by other appropriate means.
- organize and oversee the departmental faculty research seminars.
- organize and oversee the annual Society of the Cincinnati lecture.

5. Teaching Review Committee:

This committee is responsible for completing peer reviews of teaching as described in Appendix B of this handbook; evaluating proposals and allocating Department funds for Faculty Teaching Grants as described in Appendix D of this handbook; consulting with the Department Chair about nominations of faculty members for College and University teaching awards; and providing informal feedback on teaching as requested by individual faculty members.

The committee shall consist of four tenured faculty members elected on a staggered-year basis for two-year terms. In preparing the slate for election, the Department Chair will include only those whose teaching excellence has been demonstrated through such means as the winning of teaching awards, consistently high student evaluations, or strong peer reviews from an Ad Hoc Teaching Review committee. The slate should also reflect the diversity of curricular areas within the Department.

The primary duties and responsibilities of the committee are to:

- foster improvement in the quality of teaching in history courses
- assist and encourage untenured faculty in the development of teaching skills
- nominate and help candidates prepare dossiers for teaching awards
- offer mentoring and advice to faculty seeking to improve their teaching

6. Outreach Committee:

This committee seeks to support the University Outreach goal of the exchange of knowledge between the faculty and various off-campus constituencies. The mission includes teaching, research, and service. It can include such activities as off-campus instruction; continuing education; workshops on or off campus; and contacts with the media about historical topics. The Committee will also coordinate activities of the Virginia Center for Civil War Studies (VCCWS) and the Smithfield Review with the Department of History. In addition, the committee will recognize excellence in outreach by nominating candidates for outreach awards and by other appropriate means. Membership of the Committee will include at least one representative from the VCCWS, the faculty liaison with the Smithfield Review, and at least two other members.

7. Computer Committee:

This committee provides computer-related services unavailable elsewhere in the university community to assist department members in the use of electronic technologies for teaching and research. The committee also advises the chair about computer software and hardware needs and helps establish priorities for new purchases of electronic equipment. Additionally, the committee works with faculty and students to help design creative web sites and pedagogically sound ways to use electronic tools.