



The UNIVERSITY of OKLAHOMA®
Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost

POLICY APPROVAL

Department of History

Policy Document: Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion

Approved by: Department of History Faculty
David Wrobel, Dean, Dodge Family College of Arts and Sciences
Sarah Ellis, Vice Provost for Faculty

Approved on: June 21, 2024

Effective on: June 21, 2024

File Name: 6-21-24 History Tenure and Promotion Policy

Review Cycle: Annual review; Revision as necessary prior to the next unit APR review and in the case of University or College policy changes or other precipitating factors.

GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY TENURE & PROMOTION DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

Adopted Oct. 22, 1996

Revisions approved by Department: May 6, 2022

GUIDELINES FOR RECOMMENDING TENURE & PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

The Department of History esteems the evaluation of faculty for tenure and promotion to be among the most important tasks that we undertake as a scholarly community and professional body. The History Department has earned a reputation for our cutting-edge researchers, exemplary teachers, and dedicated members of both University and scholarly communities. We maintain a rigorous process for recommending faculty for tenure and promotion. The Department follows the University of Oklahoma's guidelines for the granting of tenure and promotion, outlined in the Faculty Handbook (tenure: section 3.7; advancement in rank: section 3.13.3). All faculty are expected to familiarize themselves with these guidelines.

All tenure-track faculty are eligible for tenure consideration. For faculty appointed at the assistant level, the probationary period will be six years, except in cases noted in the Faculty Handbook (tenure probationary period: section 3.7.3). The recommendation to alter this probationary period is subject to a vote by Committee A, and in accordance with the university's conditions (Faculty Handbook section 3.7.3). The scholarly criteria for tenure are the same as those for promotion to associate professor. A recommendation of tenure for an assistant professor therefore shall carry with it the Department's recommendation of promotion to associate professor.

Throughout the probationary period, the Department Chair will provide an annual written evaluation of each tenure-track faculty member's performance in research, teaching, and service. The procedure for recommending tenure in the Department of History will be consistent with the University's faculty personnel policy. Processes of evaluating the scholarship and pedagogy of candidates for tenure shall therefore accord with procedural regulations prescribed by the Faculty Handbook, section 3.7. Committee A may initiate consideration for tenure to extend the typical time frame. Such consideration is subject to approval by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Senior Vice President and Provost. Committee A will then establish a reasonable timeline for evaluation of the candidate's qualifications.

RESOURCES TO SUPPORT RESEARCH AND TEACHING

The Department of History encourages faculty to seek out University resources to support research and teaching to develop professional skills and to build a strong tenure dossier. These include but are not limited to the resources provided through the Arts and Humanities Forum, the Center for Faculty Excellence, the Dodge Family College of Arts and Sciences, and the Office of the Vice President for Research and Partnerships. At the department level, every tenure track-faculty member should be assigned a faculty mentor to provide guidance in the Department's research and teaching expectations.

The department makes every effort to ensure that the tenure-track faculty member will be observed in the classroom during the probationary period prior to the third-year review and again prior to the tenure review. All tenure-track candidates will have a meeting with Committee A within the first year of appointment to go over these guidelines and to give the candidate an opportunity to raise any questions and concerns.

The third-year review will involve a more intensive examination by Committee A of the candidate's research, teaching, and service that will take place as part of the regular faculty evaluation process for that year, including a meeting during which the candidate will receive feedback.

CRITERIA FOR TENURE

The essential qualification for tenure is the attainment of high standards in research and teaching.

RESEARCH

To be recommended for tenure, a candidate must have a record of significant publication.

Normally, the candidate will have published a sole-authored monograph with a scholarly press that meets the standards outlined below. Because all faculty eligible to review the candidate's tenure dossier are expected to read this book, the preferred language of publication is English. In those cases where the candidate has published a monograph in another language, a translation should be made available. In the past, the Department has accepted a submitted monograph in production (though not yet published) for tenure review. The Department does not accept a contract with a press as sufficient to initiate the tenure review process. In unusual instances, a quantity of peer-reviewed published work of recognized merit, and at least equal in scope to a monograph, may be taken as the equivalent of the monograph.

Measured by professional standards outlined by scholarly societies, meritorious historical scholarship in the form of a monograph typically reflects the author's ability to (a) identify a problem or topic, develop research with rigor, and apply appropriate historical methods, (b) locate and examine evidence rationally, drawing intelligent inferences, (c) reach definable conclusions and (d) present the topic, findings and conclusions in a written form that is well-organized, articulate, clear, persuasive, and influential as scholars in the field attest. We acknowledge that these criteria do not wholly apply to other valuable scholarly works, such as commentaries, prosopographies, corpora of inscriptions, translations, or edited volumes.

Digital Humanities

The Department of History recognizes the value of high-quality digital humanities scholarship to the profession. Candidates for tenure or promotion may submit substantive scholarship created in a digital medium that meets the disciplinary standards outlined above. Faculty members who wish to have digital scholarship recognized for tenure and promotion will consult with the Department Chair and Committee A to document the development of a digital project, and to explain the scope and historical significance of this work. They will highlight their specific contributions to the project and substantiate the contribution it makes to the field. As with traditional scholarship, peer review will be integral to the Department's evaluation of digital scholarship. Candidates will be asked to identify peer evaluators from outside the University of Oklahoma who can testify to the project's contribution to the field. The Department should arrange for external review of the faculty member's dossier by prominent scholars in digital humanities.

For further definition of digital scholarship and detailed criteria for the evaluation of digital scholarship for tenure and promotion, see Appendix A (2018)

For the American Historical Association Guidelines for the Professional Evaluation of Digital Scholarship by Historians, see below (2015)

<https://www.historians.org/teaching-and-learning/digital-history-resources/evaluation-of-digital-scholarship-in-history/guidelines-for-the-professional-evaluation-of-digital-scholarship-by-historians>

Public History

The Department of History values public-facing scholarship that brings cutting-edge research to non-specialists through museum exhibits, oral history projects, community-based public history projects, and expert testimony, among other initiatives. Candidates for tenure or promotion who wish to have public history scholarship recognized will be asked to document the development of a public history project, explain its significance, document the investment of time and funding resources required, and substantiate the contribution it makes to the community. As with traditional scholarship, peer review will be integral to the Department's evaluation of scholarship in public history. Candidates will be asked to identify peer evaluators from outside the University of Oklahoma who can testify to the project's contribution to the field. The Department should arrange for an external review of the faculty member's dossier by prominent public historians.

For the National Council on Public History guidance on the evaluation of public history for tenure and promotion: <https://ncph.org/history-at-work/does-it-count/>

TEACHING

A record of excellence in teaching is expected of all candidates considered for tenure and promotion. Teaching performance is evaluated in a variety of ways, including class visits by colleagues, examination of syllabi and instructional materials, conference with Committee A as part of the annual evaluation process, course evaluations or Student Experience Surveys, as well as statements from students with knowledge of the candidate's courses.

SERVICE

Candidates are expected to share in responsibilities related to Department and University governance and professional service, but such activities are considered concomitant to research and teaching, not substitutes for research and teaching. The Department strives to keep service to a minimum during the probationary period. Nevertheless, we understand that much external service (such as book reviews, manuscript reviews, panel organizing) are beneficial for junior faculty to get to know the field. Likewise, external community engagements can be desirable in the professionalization of junior faculty. With this in mind, the candidate is encouraged to work with Committee A and their departmental mentor to strategically identify a few areas of service that would be beneficial to growing their career without overwhelming their primary research and teaching agendas.

STEPS FOR TENURE RECOMMENDATION

1. In the spring semester of the fifth year of the probationary period, the tenure candidate will provide Committee A with the following material:
 - a. A current curriculum vitae
 - b. Separate statements on: (i) Research and Creative Activities; (ii) Teaching; (iii) Service. These statements should highlight the candidate's work in these categories while making the case for their contribution to the field.
 - c. Copies of all publications, including book reviews.
 - d. Copies of syllabi, reading lists, and other instructional materials developed by the candidate.
 - e. Copies of student papers, theses, and dissertations supervised by the candidate.
 - f. Names and email contacts of referees including (i) at least three scholars from outside the University

of Oklahoma; (ii) at least two students who have taken classes with the candidate, or who have assisted in courses taught by the candidate. Referees will be asked to identify any potential conflicts of interest. External referees must be qualified to judge the candidate's scholarly work and should be from institutions comparable or superior to the University of Oklahoma.

- g. Supporting evidence that, in the candidate's judgment or Committee A's judgment, would serve to justify the granting of tenure.
2. After Committee A has examined the material submitted by the candidate it shall appoint an ad hoc Tenure Review Committee (TRC). The TRC shall be composed of three History Department members who hold the rank of tenured associate professor or professor. The candidate shall have the right to name one member of the TRC after Committee A has named two members, one of whom shall have been designated as chair of the TRC.
3. The TRC will contact external referees to evaluate the candidate's scholarly work in the Spring Semester prior to the Fall Semester tenure vote. The TRC will invite the candidate to identify up to three scholars from outside the University of Oklahoma who should not be asked to submit letters of evaluation. External referees must be qualified to judge the candidate's scholarly work and must be from four-year research institutions comparable to the University of Oklahoma. The TRC will identify as many scholars as it deems necessary to review the candidate's dossier. The TRC will provide external referees with the candidate's curriculum vitae, research statement, and current and forthcoming publications. The TRC should provide ample time to external referees to review and evaluate the candidate's scholarship. Tenure review letters solicited in the Spring Semester should be submitted by the following September.
4. The TRC will compile the candidate's dossier by adding the following information:
 - a. A curriculum vitae
 - b. The TRC's letter soliciting letters of reference from external reviewers
 - c. Letters of reference from external reviewers (confidential)
 - d. Copies of all publications
 - e. Copies of reviews and/or readers' reports evaluating the candidate's scholarship
 - f. Other material deemed relevant by the TRC, e.g., evidence of prizes and awards for scholarly achievement
 - g. Teaching evaluation data, including the following:
 - i. Peer teaching evaluations from departmental faculty
 - ii. Narrative evaluations of the candidate's teaching effectiveness from instructional evaluation surveys
 - iii. Course evaluations or Student Experience Surveys/Course Reflection Surveys
 - iv. A summary of ratings received through other instruments the candidate may have employed
 - v. Letters of support from students advised by the candidate
 - vi. Evaluation by the TRC of student papers, theses, and dissertations supervised by the

candidate

vii. Copies of syllabi, readings lists, and other classroom materials developed by the candidate

5. All tenured members of the History faculty will have access to the candidate's dossier at least two weeks (14 days) prior to the tenure vote.
6. The Chair and TRC will schedule a Tenure Review Meeting attended by all tenured faculty in the History Department.
7. The TRC will prepare its tenure recommendation for the candidate and present this information in an oral report at the Tenure Review Meeting. This report reviews material in the candidate's dossier and includes a recommendation either to support or not recommend granting tenure to the candidate.
8. The candidate shall not enter the Tenure Review Meeting during the discussion of his or her qualifications. By a majority vote, however, the Tenure Review Meeting may request that the candidate appear to answer questions or clarify circumstances relevant to the qualifications. See the Faculty Handbook, section 3.7.5.
9. Upon concluding discussion of the TRC's report, the Tenure Review Meeting shall vote on recommending tenure and promotion. The vote shall be by secret ballot, and the Chair of the Department shall record the results of absentee ballots from members unable to attend the meeting. The candidate must receive a positive majority of eligible votes to receive the Department's recommendation of tenure.
10. The candidate will be asked to be in their university office during the Department Tenure Review Meeting. At the conclusion of this meeting, the candidate will be apprised of the Department's recommendation.
11. The Department Chair shall provide a written recommendation and Committee A shall provide a separate written recommendation, reporting independent opinions, by name, without obligation to represent the majority opinion of the Tenure Review Meeting. All recommendations relating to tenure cases must be forwarded according to the Dean's calendar. The Chair may also forward an interpretation of the departmental vote, particularly in cases with both positive and negative votes.
12. In the case of a negative decision, the Department Chair will explain to the candidate the process of appeal, outlined in the Faculty Handbook, 3.7.5.

GUIDELINES FOR RECOMMENDING PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

The following criteria and procedures for recommending promotion to the rank of professor in the Department of History apply to all tenured faculty members. The promotion of faculty members in the Department of History shall be consistent with criteria and procedures stipulated in the Faculty Handbook, section 3.12. Promotion to this rank indicates that the faculty member's professional stature is equivalent to that of other scholars in his or her field who hold the same rank in universities comparable to the University of Oklahoma.

Extended time in a given rank is not in itself a sufficient reason for promotion.

CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION

1. Promotion to the rank of professor is based upon the candidate's body of work since achieving the rank of associate professor. Promotion normally requires a second, sole-authored monograph published with a scholarly press, as well as other indices of ongoing scholarly productivity. Edited volumes, textbooks, book chapters, peer-reviewed articles, and translations are important indicators of scholarly productivity and stature which strengthen the case for promotion to the rank of professor, but do not in themselves constitute a sufficient basis for promotion. However, in unusual instances, a quantity of peer-reviewed published work of recognized merit, and at least equal in scope to a monograph, may be taken as the equivalent of the monograph. In those fields where a scholarly monograph is not the standard means of disseminating a substantial body of research findings, the candidate will have worked with the Chair and Committee A to establish the benchmarks by which a case for promotion should be judged, as outlined in the Section regarding tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor. Whatever venues and modes of dissemination are agreed upon, they should conform to the standards of that field and be equivalent to the amount of time and labor expended to produce a scholarly monograph.
2. Promotion to the rank of professor requires a successful record as a classroom teacher. Evaluation of teaching performance shall entail use of the candidate's Student Experience Surveys, classroom visitation, student testimonies, a review of the candidate's teaching materials and other appropriate data.
3. A candidate for promotion is expected to demonstrate sustained participation in responsibilities related to Department, College, and/or University governance. A candidate's record should reveal increased responsibility or leadership within the Department (i.e., chairing a committee or leading an initiative). Mentoring junior faculty and graduate students is also considered. In addition to this important work within the University, service to the discipline is valued, including work refereeing article or book manuscripts, organizing panels or conferences, serving as a reviewer for grants or fellowships, on editorial boards or as a journal editor, and as officers or committee members in professional organizations. Service to the wider community is not required but is highly valued. Such activities are considered concomitant to research and teaching, not substitutes for research and teaching.

PROCEDURES FOR RECOMMENDING PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

The procedure for recommending the promotion of a faculty member in the Department of History follows that for recommending tenure. Processes of evaluating the scholarship and pedagogy of candidates for promotion shall articulate with procedural regulations prescribed by the Faculty Handbook, section 3.12.2. A recommendation of promotion in the Department of History shall require completion of the four phases outlined below.

PHASE ONE: Promotion Request

In the spring semester before the fall when the normal recommendation is due, the Chair shall issue a departmental notice requesting nominations and applications for promotion. As soon as possible, the Chair shall consult with persons nominated for promotion to determine an appropriate timeline.

Persons wishing to be considered for promotion shall provide Committee A with the following material:

1. The candidate's curriculum vitae with notation of items included since the candidate received tenure.
2. Copies of all publications that have appeared since the candidate received tenure.
3. Supporting evidence that justifies promotion of the faculty member, such as images of or links to digital sites or projects created by the candidate, museum or public exhibits. Committee A shall review the submitted material and decide whether it contains *prima facie* justification for promotion of the candidate. The Chair shall notify the candidate of the decision reached by Committee A.

PHASE TWO: Promotion Dossier

1. If Committee A approves the candidate's eligibility, or if the candidate wishes to proceed without the approval of Committee A, it shall appoint an ad hoc Promotion Review Committee (PRC). The PRC shall be composed of three members of the History Department holding the rank of professor. The candidate shall have the right to name one member of the PRC after Committee A has named two members, including the chair.
2. The PRC shall complete the candidate's dossier by adding the required confidential information. The dossier will include the following material:
 - a. A curriculum vitae indicating items accomplished post-tenure.
 - b. Separate statements on: (i) Research and Creative Activities (ii) Teaching (iii) Service. These statements should highlight the candidate's work in these different categories while making the case for their contribution to the field.
 - c. The candidate will suggest the names of at least three external referees holding the rank of professor, and the Promotion Review Committee will add as many as it deems necessary. These external referees must be qualified to judge the candidate's scholarly work and should be from institutions comparable or superior to the University of Oklahoma. All external referees shall be chosen by agreement of the members of the Promotion Review Committee.
 - d. Copies of all publications that have appeared since the candidate received tenure.
 - e. Copies of reviews and/or readers' reports evaluating the candidate's scholarship.
 - f. Other material deemed relevant by the Promotion Review Committee, e.g., evidence of prizes and awards for scholarly achievement.
 - g. Teaching evaluation data, including the following:
 - Classroom visits by members of the PRC, and of Committee A.
 - Narrative evaluations of the candidate's teaching effectiveness from course evaluations or Student Experience Surveys/Course Reflection Surveys.
 - A summary of ratings received through other instruments the candidate may have employed.
 - Letters of support from students advised by the candidate.
 - Evaluation by the PRC of student papers, theses, and dissertations supervised by the candidate.
 - Copies of syllabi, reading lists, and other classroom materials developed by the candidate.

All tenured members of the History Department who hold the rank of professor will have access to the full dossier at least two weeks (14 days) prior to the tenure vote. After reading the candidate's curriculum vitae, publications, papers, letters of recommendation, and other materials, all voting members of the Department shall initial checklist in the custody of the department chair.

PHASE THREE: Promotion Review Meeting

1. No earlier than 14 days after the dossier has been made available for review by eligible members of the History department there shall be a meeting (hereinafter, Promotion Review Meeting) of the History Department members having a vote in the promotion decision. Voting members shall include all tenured members of the History Department who hold the rank of professor.
2. At the Promotion Review Meeting the Chair of the PRC shall present a verbal report summarizing the candidate's record of scholarship, teaching, and service which shall constitute the agenda of the Promotion Review Meeting. The report must review material in the candidate's dossier, and it must include a recommendation either to support or to reject granting promotion to the candidate. The candidate shall not enter the Promotion Review Meeting during the discussion of their qualifications. By majority vote, however, the Promotion Review Meeting may request that the candidate appear to answer questions or clarify circumstances relevant to the qualifications.
3. Upon concluding a thorough discussion of the PRC's report, the Promotion Review meeting shall vote on recommending promotion. The vote shall be by secret ballot, and the chair of the department shall record the results of mail ballots from members unable to attend the meeting. The candidate must receive a majority of positive votes in order to receive a favorable faculty recommendation for promotion. After the Promotion Review Meeting, the Chair shall confer with the candidate, who shall then be apprised of the action taken.

PHASE FOUR: Formal Recommendation

1. The Chair and Committee A shall review the materials in the dossier, the review presented by the PRC, and the vote of the department. The Chair and Committee A will each write and sign a letter of recommendation summarizing these materials and recommending approval or denial of promotion. In these letters, the Chair and/or Committee A may express individual agreement or disagreement with the majority opinion of the PRC. See Faculty Handbook section 3.13.3.
2. The Chair of the History Department shall forward the recommendation of the Promotion Review Meeting to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.
3. The candidate will be informed of the Dean and Provost's recommendations regarding promotion through formal letters from those University administrators. The Board of Regents will make the final decision to approve promotion.

Digital Scholarship

Approved by Classics & Letters faculty 2/23/18 | Approved by Provost 9/6/18

Under whatever name it is known—Digital Humanities, Humanities Computing, Computational Humanities, etc.—scholarship involving digital tools and resources has an important and vital place in a research institution. The Department of Classics and Letters at the University of Oklahoma unequivocally supports efforts to advance the field and encourages faculty members to pursue digital scholarship if their research leads them in that direction.

Although there are some outlets for peer review of digital projects, not every digital project is suitable for those publications. Moreover, the criteria for assessment are not broadly applicable, since the task is rarely as straightforward as critiquing the quality of an argument and its supporting scholarship. Rather, digital scholarship often takes the form of research objects such as computer programs for acquiring, processing, and analyzing data, or curated databases. The impact of these research objects may be difficult to quantify, given that their use may be limited to a specific context or research problem. Accordingly, different measures of success must be taken into account, and they must be selected and applied appropriately to individual projects. Nevertheless, scholars who work in digital scholarship are producing and refining peer-review strategies appropriate to digital projects, and the views and policies of learned societies in this regard continue to evolve. Accordingly, the Department of Classics and Letters will review new standards as they develop and adopt them where appropriate.

In recognition of these issues and the fact that, the Department of Classics and Letters provides this document as guidance to individual faculty members and the colleagues who must assess their work.

Definition

For the purposes of this policy, “digital scholarship” applies not to online journals for publishing articles, reviews, and other traditional forms of scholarship, since the existing policy on tenure and promotion covers those forms of publication. Rather, “digital scholarship” applies to work in which the use of technology is central to the project’s mission. Examples include, but are not limited to:

- Computer code for analyzing or manipulating data
- Applications for facilitating the use of datasets
- Databases created and curated with a view to supporting research - Visualizations of information
- Data models for encoding and representing information.

Assessment

Above all, digital scholarship should be evaluated in the context for which it was designed, developed, and executed. Unfortunately, owing to many factors beyond the control of individual scholars (e.g., ongoing development and lifecycles of computer languages and technology in general), the nature of some digital scholarship is ephemeral. Accordingly, reasonable steps must be taken by scholars to ensure that their work is documented and made available in an accessible and stable format, at least during a period specified and mutually agreed upon by the faculty member and the members of Committee A for evaluation. It is the responsibility of the department to take this into consideration and to evaluate scholarship in a timely manner.

Digital scholarship may be documented in a variety of ways, not all of them appropriate for every project. If the

project involves the use of existing tools and methods to analyze data, results of the study should be submitted to a peer-reviewed journal. In the case of digital tools and resources, it is expected that computer code will be documented according to the standards and practices in place for a given platform, and that instructions will be provided for installation and use. Documentation of the related technologies and their potential effect on the lifecycle of the project should also be included. As for the purpose and results of the project, opportunities for submitting them to a peer-reviewed publication should be pursued, but the overriding concern is that documentation about the project should be openly available and accessible (e.g., in a code repository or on a project's blog).

The department recognizes that making a project available in an accessible and stable format depends on many factors beyond the control of any one person. Planned obsolescence, after all, is a reality of hardware and software development, and a scholar should not be penalized if a product ceases to function as expected because of the development cycle of a related technology. This is especially the case for projects dependent on grant funding for continued development. However, if a faculty member wishes to receive credit for digital work, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to work with Committee A to agree upon a window of time for review of a project in a functional, accessible environment by members of the department and, in some cases, external reviewers. Faculty members engaging in digital scholarship are also expected to consult the staff of relevant units (e.g., OU Libraries, the OU Supercomputing Center for Education and Research) in the university regarding long-term storage and availability of their projects.

Criteria for Evaluation

The department recognizes that the criteria for evaluating digital scholarship are different for each project. Faculty members working on digital scholarship should consult Committee A early in the development of a project and establish mutually agreed upon goals and criteria for assessment. Those criteria must include the following:

- Peer review of the work, whether in the form of a published review or an independent assessment by reviewers identified by the faculty member and the department.
- Conference presentations and/or publications related to the work.
- Use of internationally accepted coding and encoding standards for data and metadata.
- Openness and accessibility of data.
- Evidence of a strategy for long-term accessibility and use.

Examples of other factors that may be considered include:

- Grant funding received.
- Collaboration with scholars at OU and/or other institutions.
- Contribution to the field.
- Technical innovation.
- Pedagogical applications.
- Evidence of adoption and use by members of the scholarly community and/or wider public.

The procedure shall be to document the agreed upon criteria for evaluation in a letter to the faculty member from the members of Committee A. Those criteria, along with a copy of this policy, will also be shared with any external referees invited to review the project.