

**DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
FACULTY OF LIBERAL ARTS AND PROFESSIONAL STUDIES
TENURE AND PROMOTION PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA**

In accordance with *Tenure and Promotions Policy, Criteria, and Procedures*, (hereafter referred to as “*the Policy*”) approved as amended, November 23, 2003. The Faculty guide is a supplement to the Tenure and Promotions Policy, Criteria and Procedures, approved as amended November 23, 2003. It does not constitute the official legislation, nor does it substitute for it.

A. PROCEDURES

Initiating the process:

The initiation for assessing a candidate for tenure and/or promotion will **normally** but not necessarily rest with the Department Chair. (F.1.1.)

All candidates for tenure and/or promotion must:

A. I.

- Name one faculty member, ordinarily, but not necessarily, from his/her home unit to their file preparation committee
- Submit their up-to-date C.V. to the Chair
- Consider submitting a personal statement explaining their accomplishments in Professional Contribution, Teaching and Service. F.3.1.5 (I)

A. II. Provide the File Preparation Committee with the following information for their Teaching File:

- Copies of course outlines, assignments and handouts and any other material deemed relevant regarding their teaching
- The name of one faculty member from the Department of History (Arts) to assess her/his teaching
- Names of students they want to be solicited for letters (not to exceed one-third of the list of students)
- Provide a teaching dossier, if available

A. III: Provide the File Preparation Committee with the following information for their Professional Contribution and Standing File:

- Copies of their publications, reviews of their books and any other relevant material
- The name of one or more potential external referees who are at arm’s length from the candidate (candidate’s names are not to exceed one quarter of the total names on the list)

A. IV. Provide the File Preparation Committee with the following information for their Service File:

- Any material they believe is relevant that should be sent to referees
- The name of one or more potential referees (candidate’s nominations are not to exceed one quarter of the names on the list)

All candidates for tenure and/or promotion have the right to review their complete file at any stage subject to the exceptions governing the issue of confidentiality. A candidate may ask for reconsideration of his/her file by any committee tendering a negative or delay recommendation. F.1.3.; F.2.3., F.3.1.6.(a) and (b).

The file is complete once the File Preparation Committee has compiled it, added its commentary and indicated that it is ready for adjudication. No original documents shall be removed from a complete file.

B. COMMITTEES AND THEIR FUNCTIONS:

B.I. All Files will be prepared by the **File Preparation Committee (FPC)**

Composition: **3 faculty members, two from the Department of History (Arts) and one named by the candidate, ordinarily, but not necessarily, from his/her home unit.**

The candidate selects **one** member of the FPC.

The Adjudicating Committee, in consultation with the Chair, selects **two** members for each candidate's FPC, ensuring, where possible, that the FPC contains at least one member of the candidate's area(s) of scholarly expertise (geographical, chronological, or thematic). F.3.1.1.(a)

"The FPC's responsibility is to assemble a complete file which fairly and accurately reflects the candidate's academic career. Its task is to *compile evidence, but not to render judgement.*" F.3.1.1.(b).

The FPC provides no commentary other than factual information necessary to contextualise the evidence in the file, e.g. referee's bios. *The Policy* should be consulted regarding the format and the contents of the File. It is most important to inform the referees of the fact that the candidate will be provided with the list of referees and will see all assessments, but with all identifiers removed in order to preserve confidentiality. F.3.1.7.(a).

Once the File has been prepared, it is sent to the Adjudicating Committee.

B. II. Adjudicating Committee (AC)

Composition: **7 faculty members from the Department of History (Arts), 2 students**

The two members of each candidate's FPC, selected by the Adjudicating Committee in consultation with the Chair, shall be members of that candidate's AC.

Each year, the Chair of the Department, in consultation with the Director of Undergraduate Studies and the Graduate Programme Director, selects **two** graduate History student representatives for the Adjudicating Committee. (Students must be at arm's length from the candidate – i.e., they should not be Teaching Assistants for the candidate, nor the candidate's MA or doctoral students, nor currently enrolled in the candidate's course.)

Each year, the department's Nominating Committee will put forward for approval by department Council **five** members of the Department of History (Arts) for service on the AC. The Chair of the Department will name the Chair of the AC from amongst these five nominees. These five faculty members, as well as the two students, will serve as members of the AC for all candidates being considered in any given year. They will be joined by the two members from the FPC chosen for each specific candidate. At least five of the seven faculty members must have tenure.

The Nominating Committee should try to ensure that the five nominees for the AC include:

- one untenured faculty member
- at least one full professor
- at least one associate professor
- at least one female faculty member

- at least one male faculty member
- at least one member of the areas(s) of scholarly expertise or relevant to the areas(s) of scholarly expertise in which candidates are expected to put themselves forward.

The **responsibility of the AC** is to

“evaluate the evidence in the file and recommend on whether or not the tenure and promotion criteria of the unit (i.e. History Department) have been met. Having weighed the evidence, it will vote on each of the categories (professional contribution and standing, teaching, service) and on tenure and promotion, and record these votes in its report.” F.3.2.1.(a)

The AC recommends the candidate for tenure and promotion, tenure without promotion, promotion (where already tenured), delay, or rejection. F.3.2.2.(a). The report of the AC has to be communicated to the candidate by November 1 of the year in which the Candidate’s file comes forward. It must provide clear and detailed reasons for the decision made.

“The Candidate has the right to ask for additional information or request reconsideration of the judgement rendered within 15 days from date of mailing.” F.3.2.4. (a).]

B.III Review Committee (RC)

The candidate’s complete file shall be forwarded to the Review Committee, via the Dean, regardless of the AC’s recommendation ” F.3.2.4. (b)].

“The Review Committee is to evaluate the AC’s recommendation to determine whether the university tenure and promotion procedures have been followed and the criteria used in its evaluation fairly applied. It does not vote on the categories; rather, it concurs with or dissents from the AC’s recommendation. It will also review standards applied in the units and ensure that they are in accordance with Faculty standards and criteria.”

From the RC, the file proceeds to the President for his/her recommendation to the Board of Governors. A candidate may ask for reconsideration of his/her file by any committee tendering a negative or delay recommendation. F.1.3.

B.IV. Confidentiality

The new rules specify that a candidate may see all of the references written about him/her minus any "identifiers" in that material. They also specify that the names of all referees shall be supplied to the candidate. F.3.1.6. (a). This combination of requirements might impair confidentiality. It is therefore important to note that the Department of History attaches great importance to decisions concerning tenure and promotion, and it regards honest assessment as absolutely fundamental to that decision-making process. Accordingly, it advises both referees and candidates that they would be violating a deeply held departmental value if they weakened or undermined in any way the process of candid assessment. Assessors are expected to provide honest and full evaluation notwithstanding the unease this may cause them, and candidates receiving criticism are expected to abjure hostile reaction, recognizing that their assessors were obligated to report as they did.

To encourage candid assessment, the department commits itself to the principle that critical observations will not necessarily prevent a candidate from achieving excellence in professional contribution and standing, teaching or service. The department acknowledges that even the most outstanding scholar, teacher or administrator can have weaknesses. Therefore, the department feels that the AC should accept at face value a letter which expresses

concerns about some aspect of a colleague's performance and yet still concludes that, overall, the candidate merits an assessment of excellence in professional contribution and standing, teaching or service. It also feels the AC should not treat any individual negative letter as automatically disqualifying a candidate from an assessment of excellence. In all cases, the AC's judgment must be based on a judicious reading of the complete body of evidence provided.

To minimize the discomfort which criticism can cause, the department enjoins its assessors to express their views in the most respectful way possible. Language matters, and our colleagues deserve to have critical commentary about them conveyed with the greatest care and sensitivity. Having said that, the department also encourages candidates for promotion and tenure to give serious consideration to the important role that criticism plays in personal and professional development. It is often through criticism that people experience their most profound growth. This is especially true for those in academic life. In many ways, vigorous critique is the hallmark of a healthy discipline and university. Accordingly, the department urges those being evaluated to recognize that personalizing responses to criticism is unprofessional and inconsistent with mature collegiality.

C. CRITERIA FOR ACHIEVING TENURE AND PROMOTION

C. I. Eligibility for Status in Professorial Ranks and Tenure

The following outline of promotion through the ranks is a mere average profile; it is to put forth a general notion of what is to be expected; it is not, however, a set of rules.

Assistant Professor C.1.1.

In some Faculties promotion to this rank is seen as automatic upon the completion of a Ph.D., in other Faculties this degree is not an appropriate indication of achievement. in all the Faculties of the University, an Assistant Professorship should mean that the years of apprenticeship are over and that the student has now become a scholar.

Associate Professor C.1.2.

An Associate Professor is a matured scholar whose achievements at York and/or elsewhere have earned his or her colleagues' respect as an individual of superior qualities and achievements. A normal expectation of promotion to Associate Professor would be between three to six years of service in the rank of Assistant Professor.

Professor C.1.3.

A Professor is an eminent member of the University whose achievements at York and/or in his/her profession have marked him or her as one of the scholars from whom the University receives its energy and strength. Clearly this level of achievement cannot be identified with serving several years as an Associate Professor; nevertheless, the rank should not be considered a form of apotheosis. The rank of Professor should be within the expectancy of all Associate Professors.

C.II. General Criteria

C.II. a. *The Policy* states that:

"All recommendations for tenure and promotion to the rank of **Associate Professor** require either demonstrated superiority (excellence) in a minimum of one of the three categories outlined above, with at

least competence demonstrated in teaching and in professional contribution and standing, or at least high competence in all three categories." B.4.

Therefore, a positive recommendation for tenure and promotion to the rank of **Associate Professor** requires the following ranking or better:

Case	Professional Contribution and Standing	Teaching	Service
A	Excellence	Competence	Competence not demonstrated
B	Competence	Excellence	Competence not demonstrated
C	Competence	Competence	Excellence
D	High Competence	High Competence	High Competence

C.II. b. **Promotion to Full Professor**

In applications for promotion to Full Professor, the applicant's contributions in each of the three areas: professional contribution and standing, teaching, and service, must be fully documented and evaluated to demonstrate that the applicant is "an eminent member of the University, whose achievements at York and/or in his/her profession have marked him/her as one of the scholars from whom the University receives its energy and strength." C.1.3. Each case should above all, reflect the applicant's own strengths and contributions in all three areas.

C. III. **History Department Assessment of Tenure and Promotion**

C.III. a. **Professional Contribution and Standing**

The term Professional Contribution and Standing captures the need for inclusive rather than restrictive evaluation in History. The nomenclature signals an approach to evaluation that discourages a mechanistic process and does not rely on any formula which too readily emphasizes quantity at the expense of quality. It awards greater value to publications and scholarly activities that demonstrate the kind of original thinking and innovation in scholarship that has the potential for creating significant shifts in thought than to the mere numbers produced. It recognizes the diversity of the discipline, avoids the marginalisation of some fields, and values the contributions to the profession of those areas outside of publishing which give candidates standing in the estimation of their peers and colleagues.

The Department of History continues its traditional recognition of peer-reviewed publications as the principal method of assessment. It also recognizes and places high value on the contributions to the profession made by candidates who create and sustain the infrastructure which makes research and publication possible through such activities as serving as journal editors or as members of adjudicating committees of major grant-funding agencies, for example. Furthermore it recognizes those areas of contribution which serve to popularize the discipline by widening the access to its scholarly productions beyond the walls of the academy and with the potential to make contributions to public awareness and public policy.

Single-authored contributions are highly valued as they have been traditionally. But the department is also cognizant of the fact that there has been an explosion of knowledge in history and allied disciplines,

an expansion of new technologies with the consequent demand for sophisticated methodologies, and the emergence of new sub-fields that cross not only disciplines but often narrow geographical specializations. This has meant that collaborative work is becoming increasingly an important engine for the expansion of the frontiers of knowledge, especially so in some sub-fields. The department recognizes this and therefore will not discriminate against quality collaborative work in its assessment.

Assessing a candidate's professional contribution and standing requires evaluating the contribution made by the candidate to the profession and to the communities it serves. It is dependent on candid evaluations made by experts in the field who are usually external to the department and the University. But in the final analysis, the assessment must be a statement of what we as a community of scholars consider in our best judgment to be worthy of commendation and reward in the form of tenure and/or promotion. The assessment must therefore reflect what we consider best represents excellence and competence in commitment to the historical enterprise, scholarly productivity and service to the professional community.

History as a discipline is comprised of subfields with differing methods of producing knowledge and therefore differing ways of assessing standards in professional contribution and standing. The Department therefore recognizes a variety of contributions which, either singly or in combination, can be used to assess a candidate's eligibility for promotion and tenure. Originality and overall contribution to the field must be judged across the range of each candidate's contribution to the profession. In the discipline of History, original work based on sustained research is normally conveyed in monographs. It has been usual to expect that candidates for tenure and promotion will be the sole author of a peer-reviewed book length monograph, or its equivalent, published by a reputable press or electronic equivalent. Jointly authored monographs or, in some areas of history, monographs that include translation and commentary on primary documents, as well as major critical editions, should be weighed according to the candidate's contribution. Journal articles, which in History tend to range from 25-30 pages, are also considered important contributions to ongoing research or as completed projects on specific themes and issues. Refereed articles that appear in the best journals of the candidate's field are normally given greater weight than unrefereed articles. Similar contributions include chapters in peer-reviewed books, editorship of peer-reviewed books containing chapters or essays by several authors in which the editor has written a chapter or editorship of books with lengthy introductions, and/or commentaries by the editor.

In history we recognize the range of work that contributes to disseminating academic research within and beyond the boundaries of the profession. Such work includes editing journals or book series, writing history textbooks that synthesize new research and/or themes and approaches in particular fields, translations of key works, and editorship of previously published articles or chapters in textbooks or books on specific themes and issues in a particular field of history. It also includes writing encyclopedia entries, book reviews and similar short projects based on secondary research. History welcomes scholars who use their historical skills in non-academic settings. Such activities might include publications resulting from consulting for outside agencies or groups and curating and writing texts for exhibitions. It could also include scholarly research which although not culminating in a formal publication is clearly identified as having had an impact on public policy and law.

Because historians' methods of research vary widely, some have greater need of research funding than others for their research projects. History recognizes the significant recognition that comes with the award of major research grants from external funding agencies, whether the candidate is the sole investigator, the lead investigator of a team project, or one of several participants. But this funding is normally expected to produce completed and published (or comparably disseminated) historical writing.

History expects its faculty members to be actively involved in disseminating their scholarship to peers or a wider public at conferences and in other ways. These include, but are not limited to, serving as keynote or plenary speakers at major conferences, giving presentations to important conferences in their respective fields of specialization at national and international conferences, and serving as program chairs of major national and international conferences. Increasingly research may also be disseminated through audio and visual media, websites and other digital means.

History faculty also use their research skills and knowledge in training future generations of historians and adjudicating the work of their peers. We recognize the important role colleagues play in fostering research by serving as primary doctoral dissertation supervisors and committee members. We also recognize that invitations to participate on scholarship and research grant adjudication committees at the provincial, national, and international levels; appointment as members of editorial boards of peer-reviewed journals; and requests to review articles for scholarly journals all involve hard work and constitute recognitions of stature within the field.

Evidence used to determine performance in Professional Contribution and Standing:

The weighting of each category will be determined by the time and effort demanded of each activity, and the prestige it confers upon the candidate within the community of practicing historians, other scholars and the public. Publications in languages other than English enhance the reputation of the University abroad and will be weighed at least equally to English publications. Book reviews and other outside testimonials by peers and others familiar with the candidate's work should be included in the candidate's portfolio as supplemental evidence of scholarly achievement. Credit will be given to works in press as well as those already published.

F.3.1.3. (a)-(f.)

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor:

Promotion to Associate Professor requires evidence of scholarly contribution and promise of further contribution. All ratings described below should carefully take into account History's broad statement above about the need for inclusive rather than restrictive evaluation as well as the candidate's years in the profession. Book reviews and citations constitute supplementary indicators of significance and quality.

To achieve a rating of excellence, a candidate will normally have published a monograph with a high-quality press, or the equivalent in articles in leading refereed journals in their field, or in other forms of peer-judged publication. This rating should be supported by explicit references in prize citations, book reviews and/or the letters of the external referees to the excellence, originality, innovativeness or creativity of their research methods or interpretations. In addition, candidates may have contributed in other ways such as serving on editorial boards. They must have received recognition from their peers as having made important and original contributions to their field of scholarly expertise.

To achieve a rating of high competence, a candidate will normally be expected to have published a monograph with a high-quality press, or the equivalent in articles in leading

refereed journals in their field, or in other forms of peer judged publication. This rating should be supported by substantial attestation to the high quality and more than routine significance of their scholarship. In addition, candidates may have contributed in other ways such as serving on editorial boards. They must have received recognition from their peers as having made valuable contributions to their field of scholarly expertise.

To achieve a rating of competence, a candidate will normally be expected to have published a monograph with a high-quality press, or the equivalent in articles in refereed journals or in other forms of peer-judged publication. Publications may be supplemented by other forms of professional contribution such as serving on editorial boards. A rating of competence should be supported by evaluations that attest to the solid quality of achievements in the field of scholarly expertise.

For promotion to full Professor:

Promotion to Full Professor demands evidence of sterling contribution as recognized by experts in the candidate's area of scholarly expertise. An assessment of eminence normally requires the equivalent of two monographs (as a minimum). The influence and standing of the candidate's work should be reflected in referees' evaluations, and in such things as book reviews, publication in high quality presses, reference citations, and recognition bestowed in awards and book prizes.

C.III. b. Teaching

The Department of History takes a variety of considerations into account in assessing a candidate's contribution in the area of teaching. Obviously, a very important concern is how effective the individual is in the classroom, both undergraduate and graduate. In evaluating this effectiveness, the department feels that primary emphasis should be placed on the success of the candidate in encouraging and facilitating learning by the students. This learning can take many forms, and the department values instruction that can promote a variety of kinds of growth and is not limited to conveying specific information about historical events. Since effective teaching requires careful coordination of all elements of a course, in assessing the quality of a candidate's instruction in different classes, the AC will consider not just the in-class "performance" of the individual but also the sophistication of the pedagogy employed, the thoughtfulness of the course design for pursuing different learning objectives, the appropriateness of the readings, and the effectiveness of the assignment structure for aiding effective learning.

Assessing a candidate's contribution to teaching requires looking at more than just in-class performance. It also entails an assessment of the extent and quality of a candidate's contribution to:

- developing new curricular areas and new courses within established areas;
- recruiting PhD students and supervising their dissertations to completion;
- supervising Master's theses and Major Research Papers and serving on PhD supervisory committees;
- coordinating large undergraduate courses;
- participating in departmental teaching workshops or events sponsored by the Centre for the Support of Teaching (CST);
- assisting in the development of technology-enhanced learning;
- serving as a teaching consultant, a teaching assistant liaison, or a supervisor of a Teaching Development Graduate Assistant (TDGA)

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor:

To achieve a rating of excellence in teaching, a candidate normally must perform in an outstanding fashion in at least one teaching context (lecturing, small group undergraduate teaching, small group graduate teaching, individual graduate instruction) and in at least a highly competent fashion in one or more of the other formats. In addition, the candidate normally must demonstrate leadership and innovation in several of the collateral teaching areas outlined above.

A rating of high competence may be granted to a candidate who has excelled in one teaching context but found a degree of difficulty in others, or alternatively, has functioned in a quite effective but not outstanding fashion in all formats. In addition, a candidate achieving high competence will normally have devoted some time to one of the collateral teaching activities described above and demonstrated clear effectiveness in participating in this activity.

To achieve a rating of competence in teaching, a candidate must perform in a clearly satisfactory fashion in at least two teaching contexts and exhibit thoughtfulness and concern about the enterprise of teaching and about students. An individual who treats students dismissively and/or who performs in an indifferent fashion in the classroom will normally not be judged as having reached competence.

For promotion to full Professor:

The Department expects candidates to sustain teaching of good quality. To assess teaching, the Department uses the criteria described above.

(For details on procedure see F.3.1.2. (a) and (B).

C.III. c. Service

The Department of History values and expects all its members to serve on Committees of the Department and/or University and in other service capacities, such as the departmental positions of Research Coordinator, Computer Consultant, and Chair of Council etc. It also recognizes that the workload in the different areas of service varies considerably. It does not, however, encourage pre-tenure faculty to take on extensive service responsibilities.

The three major service roles within the Department are Chair, Graduate Programme Director and Director of Undergraduate Studies. These positions involve unusual responsibilities and demanding workloads and are valued accordingly. The same is true for major service responsibilities undertaken in university administration at the level of Associate Dean or above. Service as coordinator of an interdisciplinary programme should also be taken into account.

The Department recognizes the importance of service activities at the Faculty and Senate levels at York or elsewhere and considers chairing of such committees particularly demanding. Within the Department, chairing the Curriculum Committee, and serving on the Tenure and Promotion File Preparation Committee, as well as the Tenure and Promotion Adjudicating Committee, is considered a heavier than normal responsibility and workload.

This is also true for chairing Search Committees and for the position of the Department's Affirmative Action Advisor in years where there are multiple job searches.

A candidate's rating in Service will be determined by the importance of the administrative tasks undertaken, the time and effort required to perform them, and the effectiveness of the candidate's performance. Community service related to Professional Contribution and Standing may also be considered.

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor:

A rating of excellence requires sustained, dynamic leadership in a variety of service positions.

A rating of high competence is appropriate for an individual who has served with energy and effectiveness in a variety of service roles and who has participated effectively and with recognized ability in departmental affairs.

A rating of competence will be accorded to a candidate who has been a good departmental and faculty "citizen," serving reliably, though rarely in a leadership position, on a relatively limited number of committees.

For promotion to full Professor:

The Department expects candidates to continue to contribute effective and reliable service to the department and the university. This may include leadership in a variety of high-level departmental positions such as Undergraduate Director, Graduate Director, and Chair.

(For details on procedure see F.3.1.4. (a) – (d).

Approved by Department of History Council on 4 March 2003.

Revised by the Executive Committee, 20 October 2004

Revised by the Executive Committee, 2 February 2005

Approved by Council, 3 February 2005

Minor revisions by Executive Committee 28 April 2006 and approved by the new Executive Committee August 2006. To Council for information, 8 September 2006.

Revised by the Executive Committee, March 2007 and approved by Council, 15 March 2007.

Minor revisions approved by Executive Committee, 17 September 2009.