



Roles, Scope, Criteria, Standards and Procedures
of the
Department of History and Philosophy
College of Letters and Science

Effective Date: July 1, 2019

APPROVALS	SIGNATURE	DATE
<u>Dan Flory</u> Department Faculty	<u>[Signature]</u> Chair, Primary Review Committee	<u>3/12/19</u>
<u>Susan Cohen</u> Primary Administrative Reviewer	<u>[Signature]</u> Department Head/Director	<u>3-12-19</u>
Intermediate Review Committee	Chair, Intermediate Review Committee	
<u>NICK C. RAE</u> Intermediate Administrative Reviewer	<u>[Signature]</u> College Dean	<u>3/27/19</u>
<u>Dana Eitls</u> College Review Committee	<u>[Signature]</u> Chair, College Review Committee	<u>3/25/19</u>
<u>DAVID J. SINGEL</u> University Retention, Tenure and Promotion	<u>[Signature]</u> Chair, University Retention, Tenure and Promotion	
<u>Robert L. Mokwa</u> Provost	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>5-7-19</u>

Role and Scope Document for the Department of History and Philosophy

Article I. Role and Scope of the Unit.

The principal mission of the Department of History and Philosophy is to provide quality undergraduate instruction in history and philosophy and quality graduate instruction in history.

Instructional responsibilities include teaching core courses to the university's undergraduate community as part of their preparation to become broadly educated, informed citizens, as well as more specialized courses for students seeking the Department's degrees. These include undergraduate degrees in history and philosophy, as well as minors in history, philosophy, and museum studies. The Department also offers masters and doctoral degrees in history.

To ensure sustained quality instruction, each faculty member in history and philosophy is expected to actively engage in research, and to make the results of their investigations known to a wide audience through teaching, publication of research findings, and public and professional presentations. Historians generally investigate the meaning of past human activities; philosophers investigate and foster a critical reflection on knowledge and conduct.

Teaching:

The Department of History and Philosophy expects faculty to contribute to the general education of Department majors and minors, to the educational experience of students majoring in other disciplines throughout the College and the University, and, where appropriate, to the graduate programs of students pursuing post-baccalaureate degrees in History and other related disciplines. In addition to the university teaching criteria above, the Department recognizes other faculty contributions, such as participation in the University Core, the Honors program, direction of independent study, undergraduate research and graduate research, and advising of undergraduate and graduate students.

The Department expects faculty members to teach a variety of courses dependent upon their professional preparation and the needs of the Department's curricula. Specific courses and teaching loads are normally included as part of faculty letters of hire, but faculty are not limited to teaching courses so specified. The Department expects faculty members to keep regular office hours for advising purposes and arrange visitations with advisees each semester. Grant writing in support of the instructional programs is expected when specified in faculty letters of hire.

Scholarship:

The diverse nature of the Department of History and Philosophy encourages a wide variety of scholarly activity. All faculty members with research expectations are expected to develop a record of scholarly contributions that is consistently of high quality and sustained over time.

Department faculty members are expected to engage in appropriate research activity to their discipline and to create and further a coherent research program. Evidence of research

productivity and the establishment of a coherent research program include published peer-reviewed books, book chapters, and articles, juried exhibitions, peer-reviewed government publications, and papers read or critiqued at professional meetings. Evidence of sustained research productivity also may include publicly engaged and collaborative types of scholarship (e.g., interdisciplinary and digital and public humanities projects), when such scholarship is reviewed by qualified peers in relevant academic, professional, and other fields. Grant writing for research support both from internal MSU programs and external regional/national programs is desirable.

Service:

Service is important to the Department of History and Philosophy and will vary according to individual faculty roles.

Department faculty members are expected to perform outreach/public service work. Service is defined as work done to benefit the Department, College and University and/or the faculty member's profession and/or to benefit the wider community. Service to the Department, College and University includes, but is not limited to, committee memberships and/or participation in University governance.

Professional service includes, but is not limited to, membership on professional committees, service as an officer of a professional organization, book reviewing and manuscript refereeing.

Public service (outreach) includes, but is not limited to, public presentations, participation in public programs, service on committees and boards devoted to public issues, blogs and other internet writing and publication for public consumption.

Academic Programs:

The Department offers undergraduate degrees in history and philosophy, as well as minors in history and museum studies. History majors have three major options; philosophy majors have one option. The history options include History-History; History-Teaching; and History-SETS (Science, Environment, Technology, and Society). The Philosophy major option is Philosophy.

The Department grants the Master of Arts degree in history with emphases in recent United States History, the History of Science and Technology, Environmental History, the History of the American West, and Public History. The degree program offers both a thesis and non-thesis option.

The Department grants the Doctor of Philosophy degree in History, with emphases in the History of Science and Technology, Environmental History, and the History of the American West.

Research activity in the Department reflects the interest and education of current faculty members. The Department does not maintain a department-wide research goal.

Majors in the Department

History-History

History-Teaching

History-SETS

Philosophy

Minors in the Department

History-History

History-Teaching

Museum Studies

Philosophy

Graduate Program

Ph.D. in History

MA in History

Other Programs

History and Philosophy faculty also contribute to: American Studies, Asian Studies, Honors, Liberal Studies, Latin American Studies, Women's, Gender and Sexuality Studies.

Article II. Appointment of Research Faculty

N/A

Article III. Annual Review Process

All tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty not subject to the Collective Bargaining Agreement are reviewed annually using the Annual Review Form. An annual review assesses a faculty member's performance over the preceding calendar year. The annual review process, appeals to the dean, and changes in assigned percentages of effort are described in the University Faculty Handbook.

The Department Annual Review Committee will be composed of three members from the Department's tenure-track and tenured faculty members and the Department Chair. Members of the Committee will serve three-year terms. In the absence of committee member(s), the Department Chair may appoint a one-year replacement. The Annual Review and Assessment Committee conducts annual reviews for each member of the Department. The annual review is based on the faculty member's annual goals statement (if different from the general faculty goals statement), and an assessment of the faculty member's performance in regard to teaching, research, and service during the prior calendar year (January 1 - December 31).

Each faculty member will submit material regarding student evaluations, publications, works in progress, and service activities at least one week before a scheduled interview with the Annual Review and Assessment Committee. Each faculty member is responsible for

establishing his or her interview time with the Committee, as necessary.

Writing (not necessarily publishing) one scholarly paper a year meets research expectations in any one annual review period. Works in progress, however, must be demonstrably part of a research program.

Following an Annual Review, each faculty member will receive one of the following ratings:

- **Unacceptable Performance.** An individual fails to meet listed expectations in two of the three categories of teaching, research, and service.
- **Below Expectations.** An individual fails to meet listed expectations in one of the three categories of teaching, research, and service.
- **Acceptable Performance.** An individual meets listed expectations in all three categories of teaching, research, and service.
- **Strong Performance.** Individual's record demonstrably and significantly exceeds minimum requirements for "acceptable performance" in two of the three categories of teaching, research, and service while meeting expectations in the third.
- **Exemplary Performance.** Individual's record demonstrably reflects an exemplary performance in two categories of teaching, research, and service while demonstrating an acceptable performance in the third or a strong performance in two categories with an exemplary performance in one, so long as the exemplary performance is in teaching or research.
- An individual who delivers a strong performance in either teaching or research will be considered to have counter-balanced a "below expectations" in the other and may receive an "acceptable performance" evaluation. An evaluation of "strong performance" in service will not be considered to counter-balance a "below expectations" in either teaching or research.
- Faculty who have not completed a full academic year at the time of their first annual review will be expected to meet the Department's standards in teaching only to achieve an overall rating of "acceptable performance" for purposes of salary recommendation.
- The Department Chair will prepare a written report indicating the Annual Review and Assessment Committee's rating and rationale for each faculty member. Faculty members will receive the written report and may request additional meetings with the Annual Review and Assessment Committee if in disagreement with the committee's rating.

Article IV. Primary Review Committee and Administrator

Section 4.01 Primary Review Committee-Composition and Appointment

The Primary Review Committee is the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee and is composed and appointed consistent with the University Faculty Handbook. The Department

Promotion and Tenure Committee is composed of three tenured Department faculty members, at least two of whom hold the rank of Professor, with one of the latter members acting as Committee Chair, appointed by the Department Chair. A faculty member may not serve on the Committee in a year in which his or her candidacy is under review. In the event a Committee member is ineligible to serve or a member is absent, the remaining members of the Committee will appoint a one-year replacement.

Faculty members serve on the Committee for a staggered three-year term and are eligible for reappointment.

Section 4.02 Primary Review Administrator

The Primary Review Administrator is the department chair. Should the Primary Review Administrator have a conflict of interest with a candidate under review, the CLS Dean will identify an individual to serve as Primary Review Administrator for the case under review.

Section 4.03 Identification of Responsible Entities

- a. The Department Chair will establish the Primary Review Committee (Promotion and Tenure Committee) by appointment of the members.
- b. The Committee will select a minimum of five external reviewers and solicit review letters, in consultation with other faculty members as needed.
- c. The Chair of the Committee will solicit internal reviews for teaching performance by the beginning of the semester in which the review period begins.
- d. The Chair of the Committee, with assistance from the Department Chair and Administrative Assistant, will ensure the following materials are included in the dossier:
 - i. Letters of solicitation for internal and external letters, letters from the reviewers, and in the case of external reviewers, a short CV of the reviewer.
 - ii. Applicable Role and Scope document.
 - iii. Letter of hire, any percentages of effort changes, all annual reviews, and all evaluation letters from prior retention, tenure, and promotion reviews at MSU.
 - iv. Candidate's teaching evaluations from the review period. Upon request by review committees and review administrators, the unit will provide access to the original evaluations to review committees and administrators during the review.
- e. The Department Administrator will maintain copies of all review committee evaluation letters including internal letters after the review.

Section 4.04 Next review level.

The next review level after those by the Primary Review Committee and the Primary Review Administrator is the College of Letters & Science Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee (CLSRTPC).

Article V. Intermediate Review Committee and Administrator.

The intermediate review committee is the College of Letters and Science Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee and conducts an independent review of the dossier in accordance with the responsibilities delineated in Sections 2 through 6 of the University Faculty Handbook Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Rights and Responsibilities.

Section 5.01 CLS Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee Composition, Election, and Appointment

The College of Letters and Science Retention, Tenure and Promotion Committee consists of five tenured faculty members, at least three of whom must be elected by tenurable faculty of the college. Elected members serve staggered three-year terms. The remaining members will be appointed by the Dean for renewable terms of one year. In addition to the requirements described in the University Faculty Handbook, the College of Letters and Sciences recognizes the value of disciplinary diversity when selecting members of review committees at the college and departmental levels. To that end, the Dean should appoint members consistent with this objective, particularly when an individual's academic expertise is needed at the departmental level.

In making these appointments, the Dean should be cognizant of the impact appointments to the college level committee may have on faculty available to serve on primary review committees. Units are encouraged to adopt selection procedures for committee members that will promote membership which is inclusive of the categories protected by the university Non-Discrimination Policy.

An individual may only serve on one review committee, the departmental, college, or university.

Section 5.02

The Intermediate Review Administrator is the Dean of the College of Letters and Science.

Section 5.03

The next level of review after the College of Letters and Science Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee and the Intermediate Review Administrator is the University Retention, Tenure and Promotion Committee.

Article VI. Review Materials

Review materials submitted by the candidate shall comply with the University Faculty Handbook document "Annual Review: Retention, Tenure and Promotion," subsection "RTP: Rights and Responsibilities," sections 1 and 7. Additionally, candidates in the College of Letters and Science must follow the requirements below.

Section 6.01 Materials submitted by Candidate

For reviews that require external evaluations, the candidate must submit the following materials for the external evaluators:

- i. A comprehensive Curriculum Vitae (CV) with teaching, scholarship, and service activities of the candidate.
- ii. A statement that identifies the candidate's area of scholarship.
- iii. Selected publications, including but not limited to, articles, monographs, chapters, creative endeavors, or other evidence from the review period that, in the candidate's judgment, best represents their scholarship.

Materials for the Dossier must include:

- a. Cover sheet obtained from the Provost's office.
- b. A comprehensive CV with Teaching, Scholarship, and Service activities of the candidate.
- c. Personal Statement that includes a description of the candidate's area of scholarship.
- d. Separate self-evaluations for teaching, scholarship, service, and integration summarizing the evidence demonstrating that the candidate meets the standards for the attainment of retention, tenure, or promotion, as applicable. Each self-evaluation shall include a summary of activities, selected products or accomplishments, and evidence of recognition itemized by year over the relevant Review Period.
- e. The candidate's vita should separately indicate
 - i. Refereed books and book chapters
 - ii. Refereed journal articles
 - iii. Invited books, chapters or articles
 - iv. Published conference proceedings
 - v. Invited conference presentations
 - vi. Contributed conference presentations
 - vii. Seminars and colloquia
 - viii. Grant proposals submitted and grants received/funded
 - ix. Un-refereed publications
 - x. Other scholarship

The candidate may choose to include other categories as appropriate to the specific disciplinary specialty of the candidate and the candidate's record. On papers, grants funded, and similar items, full author lists must match the publication or grant funded.

Section 6.02. Documentation of Collaborative Scholarly Contributions

Conventions for crediting collaborative work vary greatly among the different disciplines and journals represented in the Department. In particular, author order on published works can generally not be used to infer any information about the nature, quantity, or quality of the contribution of any particular author.

The candidate will provide a single document briefly describing the candidate's contribution to each collaborative scholarly work over the relevant review period. The candidate may choose to use a single statement to describe any long-term collaboration that has resulted in multiple publications or grants.

Section 6.03 Peer Review Solicitation Procedure

The process and requirements for soliciting peer review materials are described in the University Faculty Handbook, "Annual Review: Retention, Tenure and Promotion," subsection "RTP: Rights and Responsibilities," section 7.

Evaluators should be specialists in the candidate's field. The Department Promotion and Tenure Committee will solicit from each candidate a list of three (3) names of scholars working in the same field who are likely to be well-acquainted with the candidate's work or who are in a position to make an informed evaluation of the candidate's work. From this list, the Committee will select two names and then add three names of its own choosing. The Committee will contact each potential referee in writing explaining the purpose of the request, and ask for an evaluation of the significance of the candidate's work to the field. The Committee will request a vita from each referee as well as a statement indicating whatever relationship may exist between the referee and the candidate. Peer reviewers will be assured of the confidentiality of their comments within the constraints of the law. Evaluations from external referees should be available to the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee at a date to be determined by the Department Chair and the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, in accordance with the university calendar for retention, tenure, and promotion. Candidates shall not be informed of the identity of outside evaluators to protect the confidentiality of the review process.

Guidelines regarding who may and may not serve as referees are elaborated in the Faculty Handbook on "Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Rights and Responsibilities as follows:

3.c. "No person may participate in the review of any person with whom they have a personal, business, or professional relationship that could be perceived to preclude objective application of professional judgment. A conflict of interest occurs when the evaluating party could realize personal, financial, professional, or other gain or loss as a result of the outcome of the review process, or when the objectivity of the evaluating party could be impaired by virtue of the relationship. Examples of persons who may be excluded by professional relationship include undergraduate and graduate mentors, postdoctoral mentors, collaborators who are co-investigators on grants and/or co-authors on a significant portion of scholarly products completed during the review period, colleagues who depend on instrumentation controlled or operated by the candidate, and/or co-inventor of a patent."

The five external review letters must be requested by that party specified in sec. 4.03, and must not be solicited by the candidate. The department report will state clearly how external referees were chosen and include a brief statement of their status in the field. Referees should state either knowledge of or relationship to the candidate, if any.

External evaluators should be sent a copy of the candidate's vita, as well as a selection of relevant publications and/or unpublished manuscripts, the Department's current Role and Scope document, along with other materials, as appropriate. They should be asked to comment specifically on the quality of the candidate's written scholarship and his or her productivity, as well as the candidate's recognition in the field.

Section 6.03.1 Internal Reviews

In accordance with 8.03.1(e), internal letters of teaching observation will form part of the teaching dossier. Other internal review letters are optional and solicited at the discretion of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee or the Department Head based on the need for an assessment of an aspect of the candidate's performance that may not be assessed fully through other indicators.

Article VII. Applicable Role and Scope Documents

Section 7.01 Retention Review – Candidates for retention are reviewed under the standards and indicators in the Role and Scope documents in effect on the first date of employment in a tenurable position.

Section 7.02 Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor Review – candidates for tenure are reviewed under the standards and indicators in the Role and Scope documents in effect on the first date of employment in a tenurable position. Candidates may select a more recent, approved Role and Scope document by notifying the primary review committee.

Section 7.03 Promotion to Professor Review – A candidate for promotion to Full Professor will be reviewed using standards and indicators in the Role and Scope documents in effect two (2) years prior to the deadline for notification of intent to apply for promotion.

Article VIII. Retention Reviews

For retention, a faculty member must demonstrate effectiveness in all areas of the candidate's assignment: teaching, scholarship, and service as described in the University Faculty Handbook, "Retention, Promotion, and Tenure: Candidate's Rights and Responsibilities." Teaching and scholarship are considered to be of primary and equal importance. Service, however, is also an important feature of every faculty member's role.

Faculty members must also demonstrate the integration of no less than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service.

Faculty members must also demonstrate satisfactory progress towards meeting the standards for tenure by the candidate's tenure review year.

Definition and requirements, as well as performance indicators and weighting for Teaching, Scholarship and Service are listed in the relevant sections of Article IX.

Section 8.01 Timing of Retention Review.

Faculty are reviewed for retention in the academic year specified in their Letter of Hire, unless extended under the Extending Tenure Review Period policy.

Section 8.02 University Standard.

The standards for the retention of probationary faculty members are:

- effectiveness in teaching, scholarship and service during the review period, and
- integration of no less than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service
- satisfactory progress towards meeting the standards for tenure by the candidate's tenure review year.

Section 8.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting

Performance indicators and weighting are defined in Section 9.03. The same indicators and weights that are used in tenure review are used in retention review.

Section 8.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

Effectiveness in Teaching:

These criteria are described in Section 9.04

Effectiveness in Scholarship:

Faculty performance in scholarship will be judged effective if it is consistent over time and of high quality and meets or exceeds the standards outlined below.

Quantitative Expectations:

For retention review, it is expected that the candidate:

- have a minimum of one (1) peer-reviewed paper accepted for publication, and
- have presented a minimum of one (1) paper at a scholarly conference with abstract review by a program committee.

Qualitative Expectations:

The candidate is expected to demonstrate evidence for a coherent research program. Factors include, but are not limited to:

- prestige of different presses and journals,
- the distinction between regular and pre-publication reviews,
- scope of awards and other recognition,
- internal and external competitive grants and fellowships in support of research,
- scope, nature and venue of scholarly presentations (e.g., keynote or plenary address, invited lecture, etc.).

Effectiveness in Service:

Faculty performance in service will be judged effective for retention if it furthers the mission of the department, college, university, or profession, is of high quality, and if it meets or exceeds the standards outlined below.

Quantitative Expectations:

The candidate is expected to be a member of a minimum of one (1) committee and to demonstrate their participation in service to their profession and/or to the public.

Qualitative Expectations:

Factors such as hours of service and importance of service for matters of governance or policy, as well as scope and nature of public and professional service will be considered (e.g., reviewing a paper, holding office in a professional organization, etc.)

Integration Expectations:

These criteria are described in Section 9.04

Section 8.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators

Evidence of performance indicators are listed in Section 9.05. The same performance indicators and evidence that are used in tenure review are used in retention review.

Section 8.06 Status of Scholarly Products

Because candidates for retention will be reviewed early in their career, the Dossier for retention review may include works submitted but not yet accepted or other preliminary steps toward publication, and other materials that demonstrate progress on a coherent research program. Submitted products are to be documented with a copy of the submitted work along with verification of submission. In cases of tenure and promotion, works or products that are not yet in press, in galley proofs, or published, may not be considered as part of the Dossier.

Article IX Tenure Review

To achieve tenure, faculty members must demonstrate:

- sustained effectiveness in teaching and service during the review period, and
- integration of no less than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service, and
- accomplishment in scholarship as defined in the University Faculty Handbook document entitled "Retention, Tenure and Promotion Review: Definitions."

Section 9.01 Timing of Tenure Review

Faculty normally are reviewed for tenure in the academic year specified in their Letter of Hire, unless extended under the Extending Tenure Review Period policy.

Section 9.02 University Standards

The University standards for the award of tenure are:

- Sustained effectiveness in teaching and service during the review period.

- Integration of no less than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service.
- Accomplishment in scholarship.

Section 9.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting

The following performance indicators are considered in the review to determine if the standards in the previous section are satisfied. The faculty in the Department of History and Philosophy is comprised of two groups: History and Philosophy, and these performance indicators apply to all Department faculty. The *weighting* of each indicator may vary across and within the groups. Additional indicators will be considered if deemed appropriate and consistent with the definition of indicators stated in the Faculty Handbook.

Teaching:

Sustained effectiveness in teaching shall be demonstrated through:

- evaluation by peers and colleagues based on class visitations
- the review of course materials including syllabi, paper topics, exams, and other course materials
- periodic and systematic student evaluations by a University approved instrument.
- Advising and mentoring undergraduate and/or graduate students.
- Other performance indicators such as supervision of research, theses, dissertations and other student products, papers co-authored with students, projects conducted with student collaborators, and other evidence of direct work with students.

Scholarship:

Department faculty members will demonstrate accomplishment in scholarship by:

- providing evidence of a well-focused research program and the potential for sustained and continuing scholarly productivity that has
 - resulted in a peer-reviewed book published with a reputable academic or academically-oriented press **or**,
 - four (4) significant publications in the form of refereed academic journal articles, refereed book chapters, or other significant peer-reviewed research products.
- The professional recognition of published work as demonstrated by:
 - invitations to deliver papers at regional and national conferences,
 - Invitation to deliver papers at other colleges and universities,
 - citations, reviews, prizes,
 - the assignment of such work at other institutions
- Successful grant writing.

Service:

Sustained effectiveness in service includes, but is not limited to:

- membership on committees and/or participation in Department, College, and/or

University governance.

- Professional service that includes, but is not limited to,
 - membership on professional committees,
 - service as an officer of a professional organization,
 - book reviewing and manuscript refereeing,
 - journal editing.
- Public service that includes, but is not limited to,
 - public presentations,
 - participation in public programs,
 - service on committees and boards devoted to public issues,
 - blogs and other internet writing and publication for public consumption.

Integration:

As indicated in Section 9.02, candidates are expected to demonstrate integration across at least two of the categories of scholarship, teaching, and service. The nature and extent of integrated activities will vary depending on the candidate's discipline and areas of specialization.

Integration is the creation of synergistic relationships among the teaching, scholarship, and service contributions of faculty, that may be demonstrated by, but is not limited to:

- Integration of scholarship and teaching: implementing a research activity within a course.
- Integration of scholarship and teaching: offering seminars to introduce students to the process of conducting research.
- Integration of scholarship and teaching: collaborating in research and/or publication with a student.
- Integrating of scholarship and service: lending research expertise through consulting.
- Integration of scholarship and service: implementing research results in a community setting.
- Integration of teaching and service: designing and/or delivering professional development materials to schools, or engaging in instruction with the public.

Section 9.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

Teaching:

Faculty performance in teaching will be judged to have achieved sustained effectiveness if it is consistent over time and of high quality and meets or exceeds the standards outlined below.

Quantitative Expectations:

Teaching will be evaluated by:

- a minimum of two (2) classroom peer reviews from faculty external to the department,
- one (1) peer review from within the Department since retention review; reviewers will

be solicited by the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee.

- syllabi and teaching materials for all classes taught during the regular AY within the review period,
- student evaluation based on a University approved instrument.
- advising and mentoring undergraduate and/or graduate students,
- chairing and membership on doctoral and masters committees.

Qualitative Expectations:

Other factors for teaching will be considered, such as:

- class size, level of difficulty, structure, level of instruction (lower division, upper division, graduate) and content,
- creation of new classes, or significantly restructured classes,
- evidence of experimentation with new pedagogical styles and techniques, or other evidence of pedagogical innovation.

Scholarship:

Faculty performance in scholarship will be judged accomplished if it is consistent over time and of high quality and meets or exceeds the standards outlined below.

Quantitative Expectations:

For tenure, it is expected that a candidate in History meet the requirements in item A below, and that a candidate in Philosophy may meet the requirements in either item A or item B.

- A. a minimum of one (1) book, (the minimum requirement will consist of a completed manuscript in galley proofs or in press) published with a reputable academic or academically-oriented press
- B. B. four (4) significant publications (the minimum requirement will consist of a completed manuscript in galley proofs or in press) in the form of peer-reviewed academic journal articles, refereed book chapters, or other significant peer-reviewed research products.

Consideration of accomplishment in scholarship in both disciplines will also consider the following:

- The professional recognition of published work as demonstrated by:
 - invitations to deliver papers at regional and national conferences,
 - Invitation to deliver papers at other colleges and universities,
 - citations, reviews, prizes,
 - the assignment of such work at other institutions
- Successful grant writing

Qualitative Expectations:

The candidate is expected to demonstrate evidence for a coherent, continuing, and commendable research program. Review will consider factors such as

- prestige of different presses and journals,
- the distinction between regular and pre-publication reviews,
- scope of awards and other recognition,
- varying publication opportunities in different fields will be considered.
- Local, national, and internationally competitive grants and fellowships in support of research
- The scope, nature and venue of scholarly presentations (e.g., keynote or plenary address, invited lecture, etc.).

Service:

Faculty performance in service will be judged to have achieved sustained effectiveness if it furthers the mission of the department, college, university, or profession, is of high quality, and if it meets or exceeds the standards outlined below.

Quantitative Expectations:

The candidate is expected to:

- be a member of a minimum of two (2) Department, College, or University committees
- to demonstrate their sustained and continuing participation in service to their profession and/or to the public

Qualitative Expectations:

Consideration of other factors will include:

- hours of service and importance of service for matters of governance or policy,
- scope and nature of public and professional service (e.g., reviewing a paper, holding office in a professional organization, etc.)

Integration:

Integration will be deemed effective if the candidate integrates at least two areas evaluated as documented in the integration statement.

Section 9.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators

Teaching:

Detailed information on both the quality and quantity of teaching shall be provided.

- Faculty will use results from a University approved instrument for purposes of measuring student satisfaction.
- Evaluation of scores from student evaluation instruments will take into account such factors as class size, level of instruction (lower division, upper division, graduate), and

whether or not it is a new or a well-established course.

- Grants to support the development of new courses, including on-line courses, or research aimed at improving overall teaching performance will be considered to have demonstrated sustained effectiveness.

Teaching documentation will organize and present cumulative evidence of sustained teaching effectiveness, including:

- a brief statement from the candidate about teaching responsibilities and teaching philosophy, objectives, and strategies;
- representative course syllabi, with readings, handouts, and assignments; and summaries of student evaluation data;
- statements from department colleagues and external peer reviewers who have observed classes and reviewed materials.
- If applicable, the folder may also include descriptions of curricular enhancement and innovation, with supporting materials;
- descriptions of steps taken to evaluate and improve teaching;
- sample student essays or creative projects; statements from former students and graduates;
- teaching honors or recognition;
- invitations from outside agencies or other campuses to demonstrate teaching methods or participate in activities related to teaching.

Scholarship:

Faculty reviews regarding research are based on completed work either published or accepted for publication as noted in section 9.03 and 9.04 above. Materials that are in process of preparation for publication may be included. Materials demonstrating scholarship may include, but are not limited to:

- peer-reviewed books,
- book chapters,
- articles,
- juried exhibitions,
- peer-reviewed government publications,
- grants applied for and received,
- papers read or critiqued at professional meetings.
- Evidence of sustained research productivity also may include publicly engaged and collaborative types of scholarship (e.g., interdisciplinary and digital and public humanities projects), when such scholarship is reviewed by qualified peers in relevant academic, professional, and other fields.
- The faculty member will also submit a statement regarding his/her research program, progress, goals, and other details relating to his/her research agenda,
- an up-to-date CV.

Service:

Service is defined as work done to benefit the Department, College and University; the faculty member's profession; or, to benefit the wider community. The candidate will provide a statement regarding service performed, and a list of committee, reviews, presentations and other service activities, as well as any documents recognizing such service.

- Service to the Department, College and University includes, but is not limited to membership on committees and/or participation in University governance.
- Professional service includes, but is not limited to, membership on professional committees, or service as an officer of a professional organization, book reviewing and manuscript refereeing.
- Public service includes, but is not limited to, public presentations, participation in public programs and service on committees and boards devoted to public issues.

Integration:

Candidates are expected to demonstrate integration across at least two of the categories of scholarship, teaching, and service. The nature and extent of integrated activities will vary depending on the candidate's discipline and areas of specialization. The following list offers examples of potential indicators of integration, with the understanding that integration can take many forms. The candidate must clearly define and describe how integration is achieved in the dossier.

- Integration of scholarship and teaching: implementing a research activity within a course.
- Integration of scholarship and teaching: offering seminars to introduce students to the process of conducting research.
- Integration of scholarship and teaching: collaborating in research and/or publication with a student.
- Integrating of scholarship and service: lending research expertise through consulting.
- Integration of scholarship and service: implementing research results in a community setting.
- Integration of teaching and service: designing and/or delivering professional development or special programs for members of the MSU community or the public.

Article X Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor

Section 10.01. University Standards

The University standards for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are the standards for the award of tenure. Appointment at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor does not demonstrate, in and of itself, that standards for tenure have been met.

Article XI Promotion to Rank of Professor

Section 11.01 Timing of Review

Normally, faculty are reviewed for promotion after the completion of five (5) or more years of service in the current rank; however, faculty may seek promotion earlier if they can establish that they "meet the same standards of effectiveness and accomplishment or excellence used in evaluating candidates after five (5) years in rank."

Section 11.02 University Standard

To achieve promotion to rank of professor, faculty members must demonstrate

- sustained effectiveness in teaching and service during the review period, and
- integration of no less than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service, and
- excellence in scholarship as defined in the Faculty Handbook document entitled "Retention, Tenure and Promotion Review: Definitions."

Section 11.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting

In general, promotion to Full Professor requires evidence that the candidate possesses no demonstrable deficiency in teaching, research or service.

The performance indicators and weighting used for this review are the same as those defined in Section 9.03 of this document.

Section 11.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

Teaching:

The expectation for this review is effectiveness in teaching, and the standard is defined in Section 9.04.

Scholarship:

Faculty performance in scholarship will be judged excellent if it is consistent over time, of recognized high quality, recognized and praised by professional peers, and meets or exceeds the standards outlined below.

Quantitative Expectations:

For promotion to Full Professor, it is expected that the candidate:

- have a minimum of one (1) book, (the minimum requirement will consist of a completed manuscript in galley proofs or in press) published with a reputable academic or academically-oriented press, since receiving tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, or
- five (5) significant publications (the minimum requirement will consist of a completed manuscript in galley proofs or in press) in the form of peer-reviewed academic journal articles, refereed book chapters, or other significant peer-reviewed research products, since receiving tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.
- The professional recognition of published work as demonstrated by:
 - invitations to deliver papers at regional and national conferences,
 - Invitation to deliver papers at other colleges and universities,

- citations, reviews, prizes,
 - the assignment of such work at other institutions
- Successful grant writing.

Qualitative Expectations:

The candidate is expected to demonstrate evidence for a coherent, continuing, and meritorious research program. Review will consider factors such as:

- prestige of different presses and journals,
- the distinction between regular and pre-publication reviews,
- scope of awards and other recognition,
- Local, national, and internationally competitive grants and fellowships in support of research are considered evidence of research productivity.
- The scope, nature and venue of scholarly presentations (e.g., keynote or plenary address, invited lecture, etc.).

Service:

The expectation for this review is effectiveness in service, and the standard is defined in Section 9.04, with the exception that at the time of promotion review an additional weight is placed on active contributions to Department committees and programs.

Integration:

Integration will be deemed effective if the candidate integrates at least two areas evaluated as documented in the integration statement, as outlined above in

Section 11.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators

Applicable performance indicators, and evidence supporting the candidate's performance for each indicator, will be assessed using the contents of the candidate's dossier. The description of evidence of performance indicators is found in Section 9.05 of this document.

Article XII. Procedures for Update and Revision of the Unit Role and Scope Document

Review Committee members or administrators that identify a need for improvement, clarification, or other revision to an academic unit's Role and Scope documents may submit the request for changes to the Chair of the University Retention, Tenure and Promotion Committee. The University Retention, Tenure and Promotion Committee Chair will forward the recommendations to the unit. Submission to the University Retention, Tenure and Promotion Committee Chair should occur after the review committee or administrator completes all reviews for the year. Units will act on any proposed changes received from the University Retention, Tenure and Promotion Committee Chair and will undertake a full review of their Document no less than every three years.

Article XIII. Approval Process

Section 13.01 Primary Academic Unit Role and Scope Document

- (a) Tenurable faculty and administrator of the primary academic unit
- (b) Promotion and tenure review committee and administrator of all associated intermediate units (usually colleges)
- (c) University Retention, Tenure and Promotion Committee
- (d) Provost

Section 13.02 Intermediate Academic Unit Role and Scope Document

- (a) Promotion and tenure review committee and administrator of the intermediate unit
- (b) University Retention, Tenure and Promotion Committee
- (c) Provost

Section 13.03 University Role and Scope Document

- (a) University Retention, Tenure and Promotion Committee
- (b) Faculty Senate
- (c) Deans' Council
- (d) Provost