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All dates and procedures concerning recommendations for both tenure and promotion shall conform to directives from the Provost, and the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

GUIDELINES FOR RECOMMENDING TENURE

The following criteria and procedures for tenure recommendations apply to all cases in the Department of History, except cases with particular conditions as defined at the time of appointment and approved by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and by the Provost. The scholarly criteria for tenure are the same as the scholarly criteria 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.

Criteria for Tenure

The recommendation of tenure in the Department of History shall be consistent with established policies of the University of Oklahoma, as outlined in the Faculty Handbook, section 3.7.

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

2. To be recommended for tenure, a candidate must have a record of significant publication. Normally, the candidate will have published a book that meets standards outlined in paragraph 3, below. In unusual instances, several published articles of recognized merit may be taken as the equivalent of such a book.

3. Measured by professional standards, meritorious historical scholarship in the form of a book or an article reflects the author's ability to (a) identify a problem or topic, develop a
research design with rigor, and apply the most appropriate historical methods, (b) locate and examine evidence rationally, drawing intelligent inferences from it, (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.

4. Teaching performance is measured in a variety of ways, including the use of student evaluation questionnaires, class visitation by colleagues, examination of materials used in class, and conference with Committee A as part of the annual evaluation process.

5. Candidates are expected to share in responsibilities related to University governance and professional service, but such activities are considered concomitant to research and teaching, not substitutes for research and teaching.

Procedures for Recommending Tenure

The procedure for recommending tenure in the Department of History must be consistent with the University's faculty personnel policy. Processes of evaluating the scholarship and pedagogy of candidates for tenure shall therefore articulate with procedural regulations prescribed by the Faculty Handbook, section 3.7. A tenure recommendation from the Department of History shall require completion of the four steps, or phases, outlined below. While the procedure for tenure recommendation requires a timetable, it is a flexible one. When extraordinary circumstances arise, e.g., the candidate's receiving an offer from another university or a prize for scholarship, Committee A may initiate consideration for tenure outside the time frame normal for such action. Committee A must then establish a reasonable timetable for evaluation of the candidate's qualifications.

Tenure Recommendation, First Phase
1. The process of recommending tenure shall begin in the spring semester before the fall semester when a formal recommendation is due. All persons entering the final year (normally the sixth year) of their probationary period, as defined in the Faculty Handbook, section 3.7.3, must then be identified and given notice of their impending tenure review.

2. By the end of the relevant spring semester, persons required to undergo tenure review shall provide Committee A with the following material:
   
   a. A curriculum vitae.
   
   b. Names, addresses, and telephone numbers of referees should include: (1) at least two students who have taken work with the candidate, or who have assisted in courses taught by the candidate; (2) at least three scholars from outside the University of Oklahoma, who have not been preceptors of the candidate; and (3) at least two scholars from the University of Oklahoma, but outside the Department of History. Referees should be persons competent to assess scholarly and/or pedagogical contributions of the candidate.
   
   c. Copies of all publications (including book reviews) and copies of all papers and commentaries read at professional meetings.
   
   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. Other evidence that, in the candidate's judgment or Committee A's judgment, would serve to justify the granting of tenure.

3. After Committee A has examined the material submitted by the candidate, it shall appoint
an ad hoc Tenure Review Committee. The Tenure Review Committee shall be composed of three History Department members who hold the rank of associate professor or professor. The candidate shall have the right to name one member of the Tenure Review Committee after Committee A has named two members, one of whom shall have been designated as chair of the Tenure Review Committee.

Tenure Recommendation, Second Phase

1. The Tenure Review Committee shall complete the candidate’s dossier by adding the required confidential information. Material included in the dossier shall be the following:
   a. The candidate's curriculum vitae.
   b. Copies of all publications.
   c. The candidate will suggest the names of at least three external referees, and the Tenure Review Committee will add as many as it deems necessary. These external referees must be qualified to judge the candidate’s scholarly work, and must be from institutions comparable or superior to the University of Oklahoma. All external referees shall be chosen by unanimous agreement of the members of the Tenure Review Committee.
   d. Copies of reviews and/or readers' reports evaluating the candidate's scholarship.
   e. Copies of papers and/or comments presented at professional meetings.
   f. Teaching evaluation data, including the following: (1) a summary of mean scores received on the instructional evaluation questionnaire employed by the History Department for at least two semesters prior to tenure review; (2) a summary of ratings received through other instruments the candidate may have employed; (3)
copies of syllabi, reading lists, and other instructional materials developed by the candidate; (4) evaluation by the Tenure Review Committee of student papers, theses, and dissertations supervised by the candidate; (5) evaluation of teaching based upon classroom visitation by members of the Tenure Review Committee, and of Committee A.

g. Other material deemed relevant by the Tenure Review Committee, e.g., evidence of prizes and awards for scholarly achievement.

2. The assembled dossier shall be available for departmental examination by late September. After reading the candidate's curriculum vitae, publications, papers, letters of recommendation, and other materials, all voting members of the department shall initial a checklist in the custody of the Department Chair. At least two weeks' time shall be allotted for reading of the dossier.

Tenure Recommendation, Third Phase

1. Within one week after the time allotted for reviewing the dossier, there shall be a meeting (hereinafter, Tenure Review Meeting) of the History Department members having a vote in the tenure and promotion decision. Voting members shall include all tenured members of the History Department.

2. At the Tenure Review Meeting the Chair of the Tenure Review Committee will submit a report, which constitutes the agenda of the Tenure 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 tenure to the candidate.

3. 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.

4. Upon concluding a thorough discussion of the Tenure Review Committee’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 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 tenure. A recommendation to grant tenure to an assistant professor shall carry with it the Department’s recommendation for promotion to associate professor. The candidate should understand that the review of the dossier beyond the department will include, in addition to the departmental recommendation, a report of the distribution of votes within the department.

5. The Chair and each member of committee A shall provide a separate written recommendation. The Chair and each member of Committee A shall record an independent opinion, by name, without obligation to represent the majority opinion of the Tenure Review Meeting. See the Faculty Handbook, section 3.11.2. 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.

Tenure Recommendation, Fourth Phase

1. Within three days after the Tenure Review Meeting, and in recognition of the vote taken
therein, the Chair shall confer with Committee A to determine appropriate action as prescribed by the Faculty Handbook, section 3.7.5.

2. Within three days of the Tenure Review Meeting, the Chair will also confer with the candidate, who shall then be apprised of the vote by the Tenure Review Meeting. The Chair will also explain to the candidate the recommendations of Committee A and of the Chair.

3. After consulting Committee A, the Chair shall forward the recommendation of the Tenure Review Meeting to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

4. When higher authorities have acted on the recommendation, the Chair shall again confer with the candidate to inform him/her of the final decision in his/her case, and will also inform the department members of such recommendations.
GUIDELINES FOR RECOMMENDING PROMOTION

The following criteria and procedures for recommending promotion in the Department of History apply to all tenured faculty members who hold ranks below that of professor. 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 a given 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 of service in a given rank is not in itself a sufficient reason for promotion.

Criteria for Promotion

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

2. Promotion to the rank of associate professor normally requires publication of a book that meets the standards outlined above in Criteria for Tenure, paragraph 3. In unusual instances, several published articles of recognized merit may be taken as the equivalent of such a book. Scholarly papers and/or commentaries may be cited to strengthen the case for promoting the faculty member.

3. Promotion to the rank of professor requires two or more books of original scholarship. Published articles may satisfy this requirement only if they have brought the author the same professional recognition that two highly regarded books would have brought.

4. Promotion either to the rank of associate professor or to the rank of professor requires a successful record as a classroom teacher. Evaluation of teaching performance shall entail use of the Department's instructional evaluation questionnaire, classroom visitation, a
review of the candidate’s teaching material, and other appropriate means.

5. Candidates for promotion are expected to share in responsibilities related to University governance and professional service, but such activities are considered concomitants to research and teaching, not substitutes for research and teaching.

**Procedures for Recommending Promotion**

The procedure for recommending the promotion of a faculty member in the Department of History is essentially the same as the procedure 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 steps, or phases, outlined below. While the procedure for recommendations of promotion requires a timetable, it is a flexible one. When extraordinary circumstances arise, e.g., the candidate's receiving an offer from another university, a prize for scholarship, or unusual scholarly activity, Committee A may initiate consideration for promotion outside the normal time frame for such action. Committee A must then establish a reasonable timetable for evaluation of the candidate's qualifications.

**Promotion Recommendation, First Phase**

1. In the spring semester before the fall when 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 whether or not they wish to be considered for promotion.

2. Persons wishing to be considered for promotion shall provide Committee A with the following material:
a. Copies of all material the candidate submitted at the time he/she received tenure at the University of Oklahoma.

b. A curriculum vitae, with notation of items included since the candidate received tenure.

c. Copies of all publications (including book reviews) that have appeared since the candidate received tenure, as well as copies of all papers and commentaries read at professional meetings since the candidate received tenure.

d. Other evidence that, in the candidate's judgment or Committee A's judgment, would serve to justify promotion of the faculty member.

3. Committee A shall review the submitted material and decide whether it contains prima facie justification for promotion of the candidate.

4. The Chair shall notify the candidate of the decision reached by Committee A.

Promotion Recommendation, Second Phase

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. The Promotion Review Committee shall be composed of three History Department members who have the right to vote on promotion of the candidate. The candidate shall have the right to name one member of the Promotion Review Committee after Committee A has named two members, including the chair.

2. The Promotion Review Committee shall complete the candidate's dossier by adding the required confidential information. The dossier will include the following material:

a. Copies of all materials the candidate submitted at the time he/she received tenure
at the University of Oklahoma.

b. A curriculum vitae, with notation of items included since the candidate received tenure.

c. The candidate will suggest the names of at least three external referees, 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 must be from institutions comparable or superior to the University of Oklahoma. All external referees shall be chosen by unanimous agreement of the members of the Promotion Review Committee.

d. Copies of all publications (including book reviews) that have appeared since the candidate received tenure, as well as copies of all papers and commentaries read at professional meetings since the candidate received tenure.

e. Copies of reviews and/or readers' reports evaluating the candidate's scholarship.

f. Teaching evaluation data, including the following: (1) a summary of mean scores received on the instructional evaluation questionnaire employed by the History Department for at least the two semesters prior to promotion review; (2) a summary of ratings received through other instruments the candidate may have employed; (3) evaluation by the Promotion Review Committee of student papers, theses, and dissertations supervised by the candidate; (4) copies of syllabi, reading lists, and other classroom materials developed by the candidate; (5) Classroom visitations by members of the Promotion Review Committee, and of Committee A.
g. Other material deemed relevant by the Promotion Review Committee, e.g.,
evidence of prizes and awards for scholarly achievement.

3. The assembled dossier shall be available for departmental examination by late September.
After reading the candidate's curriculum vitae, publications, papers, letters of recommendation, and other materials, all voting members of the Department shall initial a checklist in the custody of the Department Chair. At least two weeks' time shall be allotted for reading of the dossier.

Promotion Recommendation, Third Phase

1. Within one week after the time allotted for reviewing the dossier, 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 those tenured members of the History Department who hold a rank equal to or higher than the rank of the candidate should he or she receive promotion. A majority of all members of the History Department holding a rank equal to or higher than the rank for which the candidate is being considered shall constitute a quorum for the Promotion Review Meeting.

2. At the Promotion Review Meeting the Chair of the Promotion Review Committee shall submit a report 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.

3. The candidate shall not enter the Promotion Review Meeting during the discussion of his or her 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.

4. Upon concluding a thorough discussion of the Promotion Review Committee’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. Within three days after the Promotion Review Meeting, the Chair shall confer with the candidate, who shall then be apprised of the action taken.

Promotion Recommendation, Fourth Phase

1. Each member of Committee A shall provide a separate written recommendation. The Chair and each member of Committee A shall record an independent opinion, by name, without obligation to represent the majority opinion of the Promotion Review Meeting. See Faculty Handbook, section 3.11.2.

2. After consulting Committee A, the Chair of the History Department shall forward the positive recommendation of the Promotion Review Meeting to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. A negative recommendation may go forward if the candidate so requests.

3. When higher authorities have acted, the Chair shall again confer with the candidate to inform him/her of the final decision in his/her case.