

Southern Illinois University Carbondale
School of History and Philosophy

Plan of Operation

Approved November 20, 2024

Preamble

By mandate of the Board of Trustees of Southern Illinois University, the formerly independent departments of History and Philosophy were merged into a single School of History and Philosophy, effective July 21, 2021. History and Philosophy maintain their integrity as separate academic programs in keeping with the two distinct professional academic disciplines of History and Philosophy. The two academic programs maintain their autonomy in matters including, but not limited to, faculty development, promotion, tenure, undergraduate and graduate curricula, Foundation accounts, and Philosophy's administration of the Center for Dewey Studies.

Section A. School Mission Statement

The School of History and Philosophy at Southern Illinois University Carbondale is dedicated to fostering a deep understanding of the human experience through the rigorous study of historical events, philosophical inquiry, and ethical reflection. We are committed to cultivating critical thinking, analytical skills, and a passion for lifelong learning in our students. Through our research, teaching, and community engagement, we aim to contribute to the intellectual and cultural development of our local, national, and global communities. Our mission is to empower students to navigate and contribute thoughtfully to the complex world around them, grounded in a strong foundation of historical knowledge and philosophical insight.

Section B. History Program

The History Program is a unit of the School of History and Philosophy of the College of Liberal Arts. The Program's members offer instruction in the field of history and related University Core Curriculum courses and engage in research and service activities.

1. *History Program Mission Statement.* The mission of the SIUC History Program is to investigate and illuminate the past. A faculty actively engaged in research and the dissemination of their scholarship is the foundation upon which the teaching of students rests.

The History Program teaches students about the past—to investigate and understand their own and other cultures over time. This mission includes preparing students to read and think critically, to analyze conflicting historical interpretations, and to express themselves effectively. Applied to the broader world of learning, the skills, knowledge, and perspective

obtained from the history curriculum will help students participate in an increasingly complex and global society.

Within a broad liberal arts education, the History Program seeks to give its undergraduate majors a familiarity with history as a process (the interrelation in time of the human experience in its immense variety); as a body of knowledge (the record of the human past); and as an ancient, evolving discipline in which historians have employed changing concepts and methods to discover, interpret, and tell the story of the past. The historical perspective acquired in our program together with the analytical and communication skills taught by the history curriculum will prepare students for employment in wide-ranging fields including education, business, communications, government, and public service. Furthermore, history majors are equipped for self-sustained, life-long learning, an ability most appropriate to a future of multiple career changes.

The History Program's graduate program prepares students for teaching, research, and other related careers as public historians. It seeks to provide a setting conducive to research and learning by both students and faculty. We strive to share our scholarship with each other, the broader academic community, and the general public in a continuing quest for knowledge about the past.

To supplement the By-Laws and Statutes of the Board of Trustees, the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the Board of Trustees of Southern Illinois University and the SIUC Faculty Association, the *Faculty Handbook* of the university, and the Operating Paper of the College of Liberal Arts, the Program of History in the School of History and Philosophy adopts this Plan of Operation for its internal governance. The plan seeks to establish open, democratic decision-making within a collegial environment while promoting efficient administration of the School. As responsible, academic members of the historical profession, the History Program faculty also endorses the "Statement on Standards of Professional Conduct" of the American Historical Association (1996), the "Statement of Principles and Interpretive Comments" of the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges (1940, 1969), and the "Statement on Professional Ethics of the American Association of University Professors" (1966, 2009).

Section C. Philosophy Program

The Philosophy Program is a constituent unit of the School of History and Philosophy (hereinafter called "School") in the College of Liberal Arts, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, and the Southern Illinois University System.

1. *Philosophy Program Mission Statement.* The Philosophy Program has as its mission: (a) to provide instruction in philosophy to undergraduate students and graduate students; (b) to support and develop research in philosophy; (c) to serve the public in ways that model the importance of civic responsibilities for our students.

Article II. Policy and Governance

Section A. Policy

The provisions of this Operating Paper are subject to the official Policies and Procedures of Southern Illinois University at Carbondale and to the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the Board of Trustees of Southern Illinois University and the SIUC Faculty Association, IEA/NEA. All judgments and treatments with respect to faculty, staff, and students in the Program will be made in accordance with the SIUC Affirmative Action Policy Statement in effect as of the effective date of this Operating Paper

Section B. The School of History and Philosophy

All degree programs formerly associated with the Department of History and the Department of Philosophy, including undergraduate and graduate degree programs, concentrations and specializations associated with the degree programs, minor programs, and certificate programs, are housed in the School of History and Philosophy. The Philosophy Program is the home of the Dewey Center. The School of History and Philosophy is housed in the College of Liberal Arts, effective July 1, 2021. Faculty in the School of History and Philosophy may, by majority vote, establish operating procedures as needed.

Each of the two academic units that compose the School of History and Philosophy have the status of Program within the School. The School Director leads the administration of the School.

Section C. School Director: Procedures for Selection and Removal

The School of History and Philosophy is led by an A/P Director who reports to and serves at the discretion of the Dean. The Director shall be appointed following a search conducted in keeping with the University's Hiring Policy and Procedures, consistent with current practice for hiring School Directors. In addition, in agreement with the principle of shared governance, the following criteria shall govern the selection of the School Director:

1. The School Director shall be tenured in the School of History and Philosophy.
2. Tenured and tenure-track faculty within the School of History and Philosophy participate in the selection of the Director. Selection and search procedures will include open nominations and secret ballots.
3. A candidate must have the support of at least three-fifths majority vote in each Program in order to be *recommended* to the Dean by the School Faculty. In other words, the candidate must have at a minimum the support of a three-fifths majority among the voting History Faculty and the candidate must have at a minimum the support of a three-fifths majority among the voting Philosophy Faculty. Without the support of at least a three-fifths majority from either Program in the School, the candidate does not meet the minimum to be recommended to the Dean by the School Faculty. A recommendation or lack thereof does not

impinge on the right of administration to make hiring decisions. It is a recommendation, not a hiring decision.

4. In the event that no individual receives the minimum three-fifths majority support in each Program, the Dean shall appoint an interim Director, in consultation with the School faculty. By “in consultation” we mean that the Dean should meet with the School Faculty to solicit their input on possible candidates for the position of interim Director.

5. If the Dean does not support the recommended candidate, the Dean shall consult with the faculty to discuss the matter and to determine the next step in the search process.

6. The School Director serves at the discretion of the Dean and for a contractual term determined by the University, but with the general expectation of service for a three-year period, and with the possibility of a second three-year period of service if recommended by the faculty and supported by the Dean.

7. The Director shall contribute to the teaching mission of the School and the mentoring of students within his/her/their field of specialization.

8. An Interim School Director may be appointed following usual campus processes for appointing interim administrators. Such a term appointment would be made via search waiver by the appropriate Dean, in consultation with faculty members who comprise the School, and with approval of the Provost and the Office of Affirmative Action. Faculty members will be afforded a clear opportunity to express their preference regarding possible candidates for any Interim Director Position.

9. Director Removal. Within a week after receiving a written complaint supported by a majority of the voting faculty concerning the Director’s performance, the Director will call a meeting of the School. The Director will not attend this meeting and the School will choose its own presiding officer. If the School decides by a two-thirds majority of those faculty members present and voting by secret ballot to affirm the complaint, the presiding officer will inform the Director, who will have an opportunity to respond in an open meeting. If the School thereafter votes by two-thirds majority of those faculty members present and voting by secret ballot to request the change of assignment of the Director, the presiding officer will forward this request to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts for further action.

Section D. School Director Duties and Rights

1. As the Chief Executive Officer of the School of History and Philosophy, ensure the implementation of all relevant University, College, and School policies. The Director will conduct all business and activities in compliance with applicable law, policies of the SIU Board of Trustees, University Policies and Procedures, the College and School Operating Papers, and other guidance and directives of the Dean.

2. Act as the official spokesperson for the School and represent it vis-à-vis other units and officers of the University as well as in any other public capacity. This includes promoting alumni relations for both Programs of the School.

3. Foster inclusive excellence within the School as well as create a culture of increased research, scholarship, and creative activity among faculty.

4. The Director will oversee the effective operation of the School and guide the setting of budgetary priorities. The Director shall also manage all clerical services of the School.

5. Duties Regarding Faculty.

a. On matters pertaining to the appointment of Faculty, Term Faculty, Jointly Appointed Faculty, Associate Faculty, or Adjunct Faculty in the School, the School Director shall act according to the vote of the Full Faculty, which shall have voted on the recommendation of an ad hoc Search Committee within the affected the program. A minimum of two members of the affected program Full Faculty shall serve on the ad hoc Search Committee. The Search Committee will make a recommendation to the program's Full Faculty, and the vote of the program's Full Faculty shall be reported to the School Director as the recommendation of the Program.

b. The School Director shall evaluate all nontenured faculty in tenurable ranks annually and inform them in writing of their professional performance. Annual pre-tenure performance evaluation letters shall be part of Faculty members' promotion and/or tenure dossiers. However, the evaluation of a tenure-track candidate's third year shall include the results of a vote of the entire tenured faculty indicating whether the candidate is making satisfactory progress toward tenure. Such votes may be accompanied by recommendations that candidates be given notice that their employment will terminate in twelve months. Recommendations are not binding, but they are resources for conscientious administrators. The evaluation shall be made with regard to the criteria, standards, and guidelines cited in Section V.A and V.B of the section on "Employee Development and Advancement" in the Faculty and Administrative Staff Handbook, and shall follow the guidelines set out in Section V.D. of that document. The School Director is responsible for mentoring and advising all faculty in new tenure-track appointments.

c. On matters pertaining to promotions, the School Director shall act according to the vote by secret ballot of an ad hoc Personnel Committee composed of all the affected program's Full Faculty who are senior in rank with respect to the candidate. The School Director and the ad hoc Personnel Committee of the affected Program shall act in accordance with Article VIII of this document, which constitutes promotion and tenure guidelines.

d. On matters pertaining to tenure, the School Director shall act according to the vote by secret ballot of an ad hoc Personnel Committee composed of all tenured Full Faculty in the affected Program. The School Director and the ad hoc Personnel

Committee shall act in accordance with Article V of this document, which constitutes promotion and tenure guidelines.

e. In accordance with the CBA, the School Director shall meet with each Faculty member annually to determine workload assignments for the following year. See Article VI for description and process.

f. The School Director shall be responsible for the timely circulation to the Faculty, Associate Faculty, and Adjunct Faculty of announcements and other information which of legitimate interest to the Faculty, Term Faculty, Associate Faculty, or Adjunct Faculty.

g. The Director shall approve all leaves of absence and sabbatical leaves for faculty at the School level and recommend them to the Provost for final approval.

6. Duties Regarding Graduate and Undergraduate Programs.

a. The School Director shall appoint a Graduate Studies Coordinator for the Program of History from among the Full Faculty of History and a Graduate Studies Coordinator for the Program of Philosophy from among the Full Faculty of Philosophy, after consulting the members of the Full Faculty of the School. Due to professional disciplinary distinctions and the need for specific expertise in the respective fields, as well as workload concerns, each program (History and Philosophy) should maintain its own Director of Graduate Studies, although one individual may temporarily serve both programs for not more than one academic year. Otherwise, the standard appointment is for a three-year term. The position may include a course release in compensation for the additional workload.

b. The School Director shall appoint an Undergraduate Studies Coordinator for the for the School of History and Philosophy to chair the School Committee on Undergraduate Studies and, by extension, the subcommittees for each of program, History and Philosophy. The standard appointment is for a three-year term. The position may include a course release in compensation for the additional workload.

c. The School Director shall consult with each program's Graduate Studies Coordinator before making a decision that pertains to the graduate program.

d. The School Director shall consult with the Undergraduate Studies Coordinator before making a decision that pertains to the undergraduate programs.

e. The School Director shall formally grant stipends to graduate students, pending the decision of the School Committee and applicable Graduate Committees.

7. Duties Regarding Promotion and Tenure of Faculty.

The Duties of the School Director regarding tenure and (or) promotion cases are outlined and described in Article V and include the following:

- a. The Director shall review the files of members of the Program who will be eligible for tenure and/or promotion and consult with them about deficiencies during annual reviews preceding the time when they are eligible for tenure and/or promotion. Annual pre-tenure performance evaluation letters shall be part of Faculty members' promotion and/or tenure dossiers. In addition, the Director, in cooperation with the appropriate School and Personnel Committees of the home Program (either History or Philosophy), shall review the dossier of every faculty member below the rank of Full Professor in such a way that the school can comply with University guidelines as published in "Promotion Policies and Procedures: Faculty," in the Faculty and Administrative Professional Staff Handbook.
- b. During the spring semester preceding the academic year in which the candidate is up for promotion and/or tenure, the candidate will choose to work with either the School Director or the Personnel Committee to compose a list of appropriate external reviewers of the candidate's research, at least half of which must come from the list offered by the candidate. If the Personnel Committee is chosen, the decision must be made by majority vote. The maximum number of reviewers, in the absence of special circumstances, should be five, and the minimum should be three.
- c. During the spring semester preceding the academic year in which the candidate is scheduled for review, the Director shall send requests for confidential letters to the outside reviewers. The request should set a deadline for reviewers that will allow sufficient time to allow the appropriate Personnel Committee to consider outside letters prior to voting on tenure and/or promotion. The following conventions should be followed in arranging for outside reviews. (1) When possible, a telephone call or other contact should precede a written request so that letters of request are not sent to larger numbers of outside evaluators than are necessary, and follow-up letters should be sent to reviewers who do not respond in a timely manner. (2) The candidate is to decide, in consultation with the Director, what materials (e.g., manuscripts, proposals, publications) are being sent out for review. The candidate has the right to negotiate and remove up to two names on the list of possible outside reviewers with the remainder being randomly selected. The materials to be reviewed need not include all of the candidate's work, but should not exclude material the candidate judges indispensable to his or her assessment. (3) The letter should request an evaluation of the candidate's research and make clear that the candidate will not have access to the letter unless they have retained it, though the candidate's mentors may inform the candidate of shortcomings raised in the letters without identifying the authors. The reviewer should not be asked "Does this individual merit promotion?" since the definition and application of standards at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale are the responsibilities of this university (see "Promotion Policies and Procedures: Faculty," IIIA, in the Faculty and Administrative Professional Staff Handbook). (4) The letter may request a curriculum vitae from each reviewer, as an aid to the Director in providing information for the dossier about each reviewer. (5) The

external reviewer will be provided: (a) an explanation of the relative importance of external reviews in the overall review process; (b) a copy of the candidate's curriculum vitae and of the principal materials on which the assessment is to be based, including at least representative samples of the candidate's published research; and (c) sufficient time for a complete and conscientious assessment.

d. The Director shall see to it that support in the mechanics of constructing the dossier is made available to the candidate.

e. In consultation with the candidate and in accordance with university, college, and school guidelines, the Director shall establish a calendar which makes clear to the candidate and to the home Program's Personnel Committee such matters as when the dossier will be available for inspection by the Personnel Committee and when the vote of the Personnel Committee will be taken.

f. The Director, after consultation with the candidate, shall rate the sources of the candidate's research, as required for Section V of the dossier (Evidence and Evaluation of Research). The Director should seek to substantiate suggested rankings by information such as acceptance rates, reputation in the discipline, etc.

g. The Director shall see to it that letters solicited from outside reviewers are included in the dossier file not available to the candidate and that the teaching section of the candidate's dossier contains a quantitative summary of evaluations which the candidate has submitted.

h. In a timely manner, and prior to the vote of the home Program's Personnel Committee, each member of the Personnel Committee shall be notified in writing that the dossier is available for inspection. Each member of that Personnel Committee has the responsibility to conduct an independent review of the dossier and to make an informed judgment regarding the tenure and/or promotion of the candidate. At the same time, each member of that Program Committee shall be notified in writing of the names of faculty members eligible for promotion and/or tenure so that the members of the home Program's Faculty Committee may, if they wish, advise the appropriate Personnel Committees.

i. Following the vote of the Personnel Committee, the Director shall inform the candidate of the outcome of the vote. The Director shall inform the Personnel Committee and the candidate of his or her recommendation to the Dean, and shall give, in a timely manner, the candidate a copy of his or her letter to the Dean.

j. School Director's Letter of Recommendation. The general content of the Director's letter is prescribed in the Faculty and A/P Staff Handbook. This letter, placed in the dossier subsequent to the vote of the Personnel Committee and prior to sending the dossier to the Dean of COLA, provides a guide to the complete dossier, highlighting important features of each of the sections on teaching, research, and service, and providing helpful background information to readers who may not be familiar with

the disciplines of History and/or Philosophy and their standards or with the school and program procedures. In addition, the Director's letter shall contain a record of the vote of the Personnel Committee and a summary of the procedures followed in evaluating the candidate. Moreover, it shall present detailed reasons for the decision of the Personnel Committee, whether positive or negative, as well as stating and substantiating the Director's own recommendation to the Dean. It is expected that the Director's letter shall fairly represent the School's collective judgment regarding the candidate's suitability for tenure and promotion, and shall present the detailed reasons for that judgment, although, in accordance with university guidelines, the Director has the responsibility to convey to the Dean an independent evaluation, and shall do so especially if, in the Director's judgment, the Faculty's decision is discriminatory.

k. The School Director shall, in cooperation with the candidate, prepare and forward a formal tenure/promotion dossier to the Dean. The Director shall recommend to the Dean for or against promotion or tenure or both after the Personnel Committee has voted on the question of promotion or tenure or both. Included in the dossier, at the time it is presented to the home Personnel Committee, should be a statement signed by the candidate that he or she has reviewed the contents of the dossier. Prior to the presentation of the dossier to the Program Personnel Committee, candidates for promotion and/or tenure who judge their files to be incomplete or to contain material which weakens their case, may, at their discretion, supply additional materials to complete their files or to counter the material which in their view weakens their case. If the Director recommends to the Dean against a Faculty member's application for tenure and/or promotion, the Faculty member shall be given the right to submit a written response. Any such written response must be submitted to the Director within five (5) work days after the Faculty member's receipt of the written recommendation of the Director. Such a response shall be limited to responding to the negative recommendation of the Director; no new material (e.g., new papers, books, student evaluations, letters of recommendation, etc.) may be included in such a response. If such a response is so submitted within said five (5) day period, it will be added to the Faculty member's dossier. Nothing herein shall limit the right of the Dean or the Provost and Vice Chancellor from soliciting a response from the Director to any written response submitted by a Faculty member and from considering any such response.

8. The School Director does not have voting rights on the School Committee, and the Director does not serve as an ex officio member of any standing committee, but the Director may attend meetings at the discretion of the Full Faculty.

Article III. School Faculty

Section A. Definition of Faculty and Rights

1. *Full Faculty*. All persons holding full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty appointments within the School, and all employees of the University with at least 51% appointment *and* tenure in the School, shall be Full Members of the Faculty. In addition, tenured and tenure-

track faculty on leave of absence for a period of one year or less shall be Full Members of the Faculty. Faculty who take full-time or part-time positions as college or university level administrators and are no longer fully under the Collective Bargaining Agreement shall not hold school offices or have voting rights during their tenure with higher administration until they return to the school as Faculty. Full Members of the Faculty shall have all privileges and responsibilities of membership on the Faculty, including voting rights on appropriate faculty committees of the School and Programs. But no one whose tenure home is outside of the School of History and Philosophy will have Full Membership in the School of History and Philosophy. Full Members of the Faculty are hereinafter referred to as “Faculty.”

2. *Jointly Appointed Faculty.* A joint appointment faculty is a tenure-eligible or tenured faculty member with a compensated FTE appointment in two or more programs or schools. Joint appointment faculty with their tenure home in the School of History and Philosophy will have all the rights, privileges, and benefits of the Full Faculty after a vote confirms their status as Full Faculty. For those whose tenure home is outside of the School, they may have such rights, privileges, and benefits of the Full Faculty excluding Promotion and Tenure decisions, as determined by a majority vote of the Full Faculty. Those rights, privileges, and benefits may subsequently be rescinded by a majority vote of the Full Faculty.

3. *Term Faculty.* All persons holding full-time or at least half-time terminal faculty appointments within the School shall be Term Faculty. Full-time Term Faculty can have voting rights on designated School and Program Committees, excluding Promotion and Tenure. Retired faculty who hold at least half-time appointments shall be considered Full Faculty, and can have all privileges and responsibilities of membership in the Faculty, including voting rights on appropriate faculty committees, but excluding Promotion and Tenure.

4. *Associate Faculty.* Emeritus faculty and retired faculty of the School not currently employed by the University in at least half-time capacity, and faculty with term appointments shall be Associate Members of the Faculty. Associate Members shall have responsibilities of membership appropriate to their association with the School, and all privileges of membership except voting rights on faculty committees. Associate Members of the Faculty are hereinafter referred to as “Associate Faculty.”

5. *Adjunct Faculty.* Upon recommendation of the School Director, the School Faculty may designate persons as Adjunct Faculty for a specified period of time. Adjunct Faculty may be given specific privileges within the School and the University as designated on an individual basis but does not include voting privileges on faculty committees.

6. *Affiliated Faculty.* Affiliated Faculty must have a primary appointment within a School or College. The primary unit will be responsible for annual reviews of the faculty member’s reappointment, tenure, promotion, and salary consideration. Affiliated faculty appointments are at the same rank as a faculty member’s primary appointment. Affiliated faculty will not be granted tenure and/or promoted within a unit in which they hold an affiliated appointment. Affiliated faculty do not have voting privileges.

7. *Rescinding Membership.* All persons in positions with tenure homes outside of the School of History and Philosophy can have their membership in and (or) their affiliated status with the School rescinded by a majority vote by the Full Faculty.

Article IV: School Structure and Committees

Section A. School Committee

1. *Chair:* The Director of the School of History and Philosophy (hereafter School Director).
2. *Membership:* All Faculty holding a primary teaching assignment within the School of History and Philosophy as well as one representative from the graduate student organizations of History and Philosophy, respectively, who are non-voting members.
3. *Meetings:* The School Committee shall meet three times each semester, or as needs arise. It can be called into meeting either by the School Director or by two or more Full Members of the Faculty.
4. *Notification of Meetings:* The School Director shall notify all Faculty of all meetings of the School Committee at least seven days prior to the date of the meeting. All notifications of meetings of the School Committee shall be accompanied by an agenda of business to be discussed, including the minutes of the previous meeting.
5. *Responsibilities:* The School Committee is the main plenary body of the School of History and Philosophy responsible for all matters affecting the School as a whole.
6. *Procedures:*
 - a. All meetings of the School Committee shall be governed by *Robert's Rules of Order* (newly revised).
 - b. Two-thirds of all Full Members of the Faculty shall constitute a quorum, excluding members who are on a leave of absence.
 - c. Proxy participation and proxy voting are not permitted. Faculty may, however, vote absentee on any agenda item of any meeting by notifying the School Director of their vote prior to the meeting.

Section B. Programs

1. The School of History and Philosophy contains two Programs: the History Program and the Philosophy Program. Faculty membership in a Program will be determined by instructional assignment. Faculty with a primary teaching assignment supporting the B.A., M.A., and/or Ph.D. in History/Historical Studies will have primary membership in the Program of History. Faculty with a primary teaching assignment supporting the B.A., M.A., and/or Ph.D. in Philosophy shall have primary membership in the Program of Philosophy.

2. Undergraduate and Graduate Studies Committees: Faculty holding primary membership in the Program of History shall be appointed by the School Director to either the History Program's Undergraduate Studies Subcommittee and, by default, the School Undergraduate Studies Committee, or History's Graduate Studies Committee, with half of the members of the Program serving on one committee and the other half on the other. Faculty holding primary membership in the Program of Philosophy shall be appointed by the School Director to either the Philosophy Program's Undergraduate Studies Subcommittee and, by default, the School Undergraduate Studies Committee, or Philosophy's Graduate Studies Committee, again with half of the members of the Program serving on one committee and the other half on the other. Membership on these committees is for a one-year period which may be renewed.
3. Program responsibilities include: a) all undergraduate and graduate-level curricular matters pertaining specifically to that Program (including changes to courses offered and academic degree requirements and the creation or alteration of certificates, minors, or specializations) subject to ratification by the School Committee; b) annual assessment of academic degree programs housed within the Program; c) selection of graduate students for admission to graduate programs, along with recommendations of funding; d) selection of scholarship and other award recipients for those awards that designate only students specifically from a program; and e) all other matters specifically pertaining to a Program rather than the School as a whole.
4. Program decisions requiring a vote, including any changes to the curriculum or selection of award recipients shall pass by a simple majority within the affected Program subject to ratification by the School Committee.
5. The School Director, in consultation with faculty within a given Program, will appoint a Graduate Studies Coordinator for each program and a single Undergraduate Coordinator for the School. Each officer shall serve a three-year term which may be renewed once. Depending on the needs of a given Program and staffing availability, these roles may be combined at the discretion of the School Director.
6. The Undergraduate Studies Coordinator shall primarily be responsible for all undergraduate-related matters within the School. The Undergraduate Studies Coordinator shall also a) serve as the chair of the Undergraduate Studies Committee for the School, including the constituent subcommittees for each Program and execute its decisions in coordination with the School Director; b) provide liaison between the School and other University units in all undergraduate-related matters; c) serve on the School Steering Committee; d) conduct a program for recruiting and advising undergraduate majors and minors; e) disseminate to undergraduates information pertinent to available courses, requirements, policies, etc.; f) oversee recruitment and retention efforts relating to the undergraduate program(s); h) coordinate assessment of the undergraduate degree programs; and i) supervise the annual process of administering Program honors and awards..

7. The Graduate Studies Coordinator shall primarily be responsible for all graduate-related matters within a Program. The Graduate Studies Coordinator shall also a) serve as the chair of the Graduate Studies Committee of a given Program and execute its decisions in coordination with the School Director, including graduate student funding; b) provide liaison between the Program and other University units in all graduate-related matters; c) serve on the School Steering Committee; d) screen student admission applications (with the assistance of the Graduate Studies Committee); e) supervise the maintenance of student records; f) advise applicants and newly admitted students; g) conduct an advisement program for continuing students; h) disseminate information pertinent to available courses, requirements, policies, etc.; i) monitor student progress toward the degree; and j) coordinate the preparation, administration, and grading of comprehensive and preliminary examinations, as well as post-examination notification and consultation.
8. The School shall have an Undergraduate Studies Committee, which is comprised of two Program Subcommittees whose primary responsibilities include all matters pertaining to the undergraduate specializations, certificates, minors, and/or degrees of that Program. The members of the program subcommittees will also serve on the School Undergraduate Studies Committee, which will undertake necessary actions recommended by the two program subcommittees.
Chair: The Undergraduate Studies Coordinator.
Membership: In consultation with the Undergraduate Studies Coordinator, the School Director shall appoint half of the faculty belonging to a Program to serve on the committee for a one-year term, which may be renewed. When possible, Faculty serving on a program's Undergraduate Studies Committee will not serve on its Graduate Studies Committee, and vice-versa.
9. Each Program shall have a Graduate Studies Committee whose primary responsibilities include all matters pertaining to the graduate specializations, certificates, and/or degrees of that Program.
Chair: The Program Graduate Studies Coordinator.
Membership: In consultation with a given Program's Graduate Studies Coordinator, the School Director shall appoint half of the faculty belonging to a Program to serve on the committee for a one-year term, which may be renewed. When possible, Faculty serving on a program's Graduate Studies Committee will not serve on its Undergraduate Studies Committee, and vice-versa.

Section C: Steering Committee

1. *Chair:* School Director.
2. *Membership:* School Director, Undergraduate Studies Coordinator, and the two Graduate Studies Coordinators for History and Philosophy; one member chosen at large from each Program.

3. *Responsibilities*: a) in-between School Committee meetings and as necessary, act as a forum for all School-wide matters; b) assist the School Director in setting any School Committee meeting agendas; c) in consultation with individual faculty members, assist the School Director in scheduling courses.

Section D: Retention and Tenure Committee

1. *Chair*: School Director
2. *Membership*: All tenured faculty holding a 51% or greater appointment within the School.
3. *Responsibilities*: All matters relating to tenure and retention of faculty.
4. *Procedures*: If there are untenured members of the School, the School Director will appoint a subcommittee consisting of all tenured faculty within the relevant Program of History or Philosophy. This subcommittee will meet each academic year while a faculty member is untenured to review the progress of the untenured member and make recommendations to the full Committee. Tenure recommendations at the end of the probationary period will be made by the full Committee by a simple majority vote and according to the Tenure and Promotion Guidelines of History or Philosophy, respectively, based on the primary teaching assignment of the faculty member. Proxy voting is not permitted. All meetings either of subcommittees or the full Committee require a quorum of two-thirds.

Section E: Promotion Committee

1. *Chair*: School Director.
2. *Membership*: All full and associate professors within the School holding a 51% or greater appointment.
3. *Responsibilities*: make recommendations regarding the promotion of School faculty.
4. *Procedures*: If any member of the School notifies the School Director of a wish to be considered for promotion, the School Director will first appoint a subcommittee of faculty within the relevant Program of the rank aspired to (supplemented as necessary with Faculty of that rank from the School or the broader College) to review the candidate's application and make recommendations to the full Committee. For promotions to associate professor, all tenured faculty within the relevant Program holding a 51% or greater appointment within the School will be appointed to the initial subcommittee, whereas for promotions to full professor, only full professors within the relevant Program will be appointed. Promotion recommendations will be made by the full Committee by a simple majority and according to the Tenure and Promotion Guidelines of History or Philosophy, respectively, based on the primary teaching assignment of the faculty member. Proxy voting is not permitted. All meetings either of

subcommittees or the full Committee require a quorum of two-thirds.

Section F: Grievance Committees

1. *Faculty Grievances*: Faculty grievances are governed by university policies and the Collective Bargaining Agreement negotiated between the SIUC Faculty Association and the Board of Trustees of Southern Illinois University.
2. *Grievances by Undergraduate and Graduate Students against Instructors*: Any grievance will first be considered by the Director who shall confirm that the student addressed their complaint first to the instructor and that the instructor provided an explanation. The Director shall hear both sides and determine whether there is merit to proceed with the grievance. If the grievance proceeds and if the grievance is against a teaching assistant, the student will inform the supervising faculty member of the complaint, and the three parties will attempt to resolve the dispute informally.
3. *Informal Resolution and Appointment of Grievance Committees*: Upon acceptance of a complaint against an instructor, the Director will attempt to resolve the dispute through mediation. Should this effort fail, the Director, in consultation with the parties to the dispute, will appoint an ad hoc Grievance Committee of four faculty members, having at least one member from each Program. No person who is named in the complaint will be allowed to serve on the Grievance Committee.
4. *Other Procedures*: The Grievance Committee will make every effort to resolve the dispute in a fair and impartial manner. On a date suitable to both sides, the Grievance Committee will hold a hearing on the merits of the complaint, letting each side present, call witnesses, question each other's witnesses, present evidence and summarize its case within time limits that the Committee imposes equally on both sides. A formal record of the meeting will be taken and this record will be made available to all principals. In its deliberations, the Grievance Committee will adhere to the principle that instructors enjoy substantial autonomy in the conduct of their courses, and this autonomy can be abridged only if the evidence demonstrates that the instructor has been guilty of arbitrary or irresponsible conduct. The Grievance Committee will, in a timely fashion, provide its decision to the parties to the dispute. The School Director will execute the decision of the Grievance Committee.

Section G: Creation of Other Committees: Faculty of the School of History and Philosophy may vote to establish new or special committees by a two-thirds vote, excepting those members on a leave of absence. Appointments to these committees shall be made by the School Director unless voted otherwise.

Article V. Procedures and Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure

A. School Procedures for Promotion and Tenure

1. The School of History and Philosophy shall operate within the promotion and tenure provisions of the collective bargaining agreement between the SIUC Faculty Association and the Board of Trustees of Southern Illinois University. Mindful and respectful of the disciplinary differences between History and Philosophy, the School establishes the following further procedures for promotion and tenure deliberations.

The School Director is responsible for regular review of all faculty eligible for tenure and promotion, following timelines and guidelines established by the policies of the University, the College of Liberal Arts, and the School of History and Philosophy. The School Director shall consult an appropriately constituted Promotion and Tenure Committee before transmitting a tenure and (or) promotion recommendation to the Dean.

The School's Promotion and Tenure Committee for a tenure decision shall consist of all tenured faculty in the School. The School Committee for a promotion decision shall consist of all faculty in the School senior in rank to the candidate.

All Promotion and Tenure Committee deliberations shall be conducted in confidence. The Committee shall vote by secret ballot. The vote of the Committee shall be recorded in the School Director's recommendation letter to the Dean.

In the case of a candidate who is under final review for tenure (or promotion and tenure, in the case of a candidate who is an Assistant Professor) and who has not elected to withdraw his/her/their name as specified below, the candidate's dossier shall be forwarded to the Dean for review and action regardless of whether the recommendations of the School Committee and the School Director are positive or negative.

In the case of a tenured member of the faculty who is being considered for promotion, and in the case of an untenured member of the faculty who is being considered for early tenure and/or promotion, if both the School Director and the School Committee do not recommend tenure and/or promotion, then the candidate's dossier will not be forwarded to the Dean for further consideration on that matter unless the candidate so requests.

At any point in the process, however, a candidate for promotion and/or tenure may elect by written request to withdraw his/her/their name from further consideration.

2. Mentoring Responsibility. The School Director is responsible for mentoring and advising all faculty in new tenure-track appointments. When a new tenure-track appointment is made, a Mentoring Committee (two or three members) shall be appointed by the School Director in consultation with the new faculty member and the prospective mentors. Service on this committee shall be voluntary, and changes in membership should be made when appropriate. The Mentoring Committee is strictly advisory; its goal is to facilitate the candidate's professional development and progress towards tenure and promotion.

In the first years of a new appointment, the School Director, assisted by the Mentoring Committee, shall consult with the new faculty member, as appropriate, on matters related to professional development and the tenure/promotion process (e.g., general strategies for success, selection of appropriate journals, and setting priorities). In addition, the School Director, assisted by the Mentoring Committee, should help and encourage the candidate to begin constructing a tenure dossier, and should advise the candidate on appropriate materials to include.

During the year preceding the academic year in which the candidate is scheduled for review for promotion and/or tenure, the School Director, assisted by the Mentoring Committee, shall advise the candidate, as appropriate, on various aspects of dossier preparation, including required features of the dossier, the basic university format, and appropriate ways to present evidence of success in teaching, research, and service.

3. Candidate Rights and Responsibilities. Ultimate responsibility for any candidate's record of research, teaching, and service lies with the candidate. Correspondingly, and in accordance with stated University policy (see "Promotion Policies and Procedures: Faculty" in the Faculty and Administrative Professional Staff Handbook) candidates shall have the right to assemble their own dossiers, providing any evidence they think will strengthen their cases, subject to the general constraints outlined in the appropriate university, college, school documents. In addition, members of the School shall have the right to ask the School Committee to consider them for promotion and/or tenure. The candidate's responsibilities include the following:

- a. The candidate should keep relevant materials in anticipation of tenure and promotion decisions. Relevant materials may include such items as syllabi, examinations, grant proposals, reprints of published work, teaching evaluations or evaluation summaries, copies of reviews, solicited and unsolicited letters, workload agreements, and similar items. This list is not intended to be exhaustive, nor is each of its items required.
- b. During the spring semester preceding the academic year in which the candidate is under review for promotion and/or tenure, the candidate shall provide to the School Director a list of appropriate outside reviewers of the candidate's research.
- c. The candidate shall provide to the School Director materials to be copied and sent to outside reviewers. Materials shall include a current vitae and representative publications.
- d. The candidate, with the advice of the Mentoring Committee and the support of the School Director and office staff, shall assemble a dossier which shall be made available to members of the School Committee sufficiently prior to their vote on the tenure and/or promotion of the candidate to allow them to examine the materials. Such materials should include, at a minimum: a complete vitae; copies of all publications; quantitative and qualitative evidence of teaching effectiveness over a

representative range of courses the candidate has taught at this university; copies of all letters solicited from outside reviewers (with the exception of letters that are unduly late).

e. The candidate shall work with the School Director to assemble a final dossier to be sent to the Dean subsequent to the vote of the School Committee regarding the candidate's promotion and/or tenure. This dossier shall include the School Director's letter and the report of the vote of the School Committee, and shall follow all required university, college, school guidelines for the construction of dossiers.

3. Materials to be included in the candidate's dossier.

a. Basic Information. See the required university format for dossiers in the Faculty and Administrative Professional Staff Handbook.

b. The curriculum vitae. The basic descriptive document forming a dossier is a complete curriculum vitae. The curriculum vitae should follow the form established by the College of Liberal Arts.

c. School Director's Letter of Recommendation.

d. Evidence and Evaluation Regarding Quality of Teaching. At the beginning of each section of evidence there should be a brief introduction to the section, e.g., in this section there may be a brief statement of teaching philosophy. It is also helpful to include a list of courses taught during the period since the candidate was hired (in the case of tenure) or since the last review (in the case of promotion). Moreover, this section should include multiple indicators of teaching effectiveness, including a quantitative summary of student evaluations of at least a representative range of courses the candidate has taught at this university.

In addition to the quantitative summary of student evaluations, reactions of colleagues and students that may be considered include: (a) letters from students and student comments on evaluation forms; (b) receipt of awards for outstanding teaching, (c) opinions of other members of the candidate's discipline, particularly if based on class visitations or on attendance at public lectures or lectures before professional societies given by the candidate, (d) number and caliber of students guided in research by the candidate or attracted to the University by the candidate's reputation as scholar and teacher, and (e) evidence of effective learning, such as mastery of material by students taught by the candidate in courses prerequisite to those of the informant. Other forms of student and/or colleague reaction may also be appropriate. For example, a candidate might present evidence based on pre-test/post-test comparisons or other performance measures indicating that the amount of student learning of the material in the candidate's classes has been particularly high. Similarly, if the candidate's colleagues consider the candidate a catalyst for the initiation of new approaches to teaching in their own courses, this should also be noted.

Prepared materials that are relevant to the assessment of teaching include course syllabi and examinations. Qualitative judgments may include an assessment of the care with which instructional materials, such as texts, have been selected; use of instructional aids such as films; and appropriate use of the course format. One focus of concern should be on the quality of mind brought to bear on the enterprise of teaching. Also, to be considered under prepared materials is any record of the development of techniques or modes of instruction, including substantial revision of existing courses or development of new courses. Textbooks authored by the candidate can also constitute a significant contribution to teaching. A proposal for a grant for curriculum development, if successful, may also be considered as an instance of prepared materials when the grant project aims toward improvement in instruction.

The section regarding teaching or the Director's letter should indicate the sources of evidence on which the appraisal of teaching competence has been based. Surveys of student opinion of teaching are valuable but should be supplemented by other forms of evaluation. Student evaluations should be interpreted by the Director in the School Director's Letter of Recommendation. Thus, if a particular instructor's teaching load for a period of time consisted principally of generally unpopular required courses or if there was a particularly significant event in a given semester that might have influenced student opinion, such facts should be made known. In addition, if the student evaluations of a particular instructor's teaching of generally unpopular required courses is significantly higher or lower than that of other members of the School, these facts should also be made known.

e. Evidence and Evaluation Regarding Research. At the beginning of this section of evidence there should be a brief overview of past and future research, i.e., a research statement. In addition, this section must include the letters from outside reviewers and the School Director's ratings of all the venues of the candidate's research (e.g., publishers, journals, conferences, etc.) that is to be considered for purposes of the review.

An analytical summary of the research or creative record is useful and can be persuasive in making a case. This kind of summary analysis, however, should not be considered a substitute for qualitative judgment. Counting and sorting publications is not the same as evaluating their quality, and the evaluation is what is important.

A few works of high quality are more important than numerous insignificant works. Evaluation of the quality of research requires attention to whether the work is that of a single author and if not, the percentage of contribution from each individual; the quality of the publication venue; whether the work is an integral part of an ongoing research or creative program; whether the work demonstrates promise of impact and continuing work; whether the work reveals evidence of significant post-doctoral research; and how the work is regarded by peers in the field.

The standards and status of scholarly presses and journals vary considerably. Therefore, each dossier should contain a discussion of the quality of the press or journals in which the

scholarly work appears, e.g., standing in the discipline or subdiscipline, acceptance rates, critical standards, and readership.

Reviews, citations, and appraisals in the publications of others should be taken as significant testimony of the quality of the candidate's work. The record of research grant proposals and fellowships applied for and awarded should be examined and interpreted. A positive pattern of professional development as scholar should be demonstrated.

Original work should be considered as evidence only after acceptance for publication. A given achievement should not be counted as an accomplishment justifying advancement of a faculty member if it has been employed in earlier justifications, except in the obvious sense of counting as part of a cumulative record. In cases where a scholarly work has appreciated in stature and importance after its initial publication, evidence of such appreciation should be demonstrated by means of reviews, anthologies, and significant citations. Such evidence may be considered in context for subsequent promotion decisions.

f. Outside letters of evaluation of research. Letters of evaluation from scholars outside the university with recognized distinction in the candidate's field of specialization shall be required in all cases of tenure or promotion. Unless the candidate requests otherwise, all outside reviewers should be broadly within the candidate's tradition in philosophy, and in every case reviewers should be clearly qualified to assess the candidate's research. Outside reviewers should be faculty members of peer universities and should be at, or above, the rank being considered for promotion. The value of outside letters depends on the choice of appropriate persons who are discriminating judges and who are familiar with the candidate's work or will take the trouble to study it. Letters from the candidate's major professor, or the candidate's graduate student colleagues, are generally less persuasive to a case than more clearly objective sources and should therefore, as a rule, be avoided. However, it is expected that some of the reviewers will be known by the candidate. Copies of outside letters and an evaluation of the credentials of the referees should accompany the dossier. Further, a copy of the letter soliciting the external evaluation (or an explanation in the Director's letter of the procedure followed) should be included as part of the dossier.

g. Evidence and Evaluation Regarding Service. At the beginning of this section of evidence there should be a brief introduction to the section, i.e., a list of service activities. Candidates should avoid unnecessary "padding" in the dossier generally, but especially in this section. When documenting service, emphasis should be given to other than routine school or college activities; a list of routine service activities at the beginning of the section normally suffices.

Service is expected of all faculty as part of the normal performance of duties and should be taken into account in making an overall assessment of an individual's qualifications for advancement. Service on College and University committees will not normally be expected of non-tenured, tenure-track faculty.

Some examples of service to be considered are effective academic advising of students; discipline, college, or university committee work, particularly involving authorship of reports that subsequently are adopted as policy; special assignments undertaken at the request of the administration such as curriculum development projects; Chairpersonships; work with student organizations or initiatives of students; professional consulting activity; honorific membership or leadership in scholarly societies; leadership in national professional associations; professional editorial assignment for national refereed journals or for scholarly publishers; and honors and special recognition awarded.

4. Standards for Promotion and Tenure

a. Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure. Quality and quantity of published scholarly research are both important indicators of research productivity. There must be a sufficient quantity of published work in order for there to be an evaluation of general quality of the candidate's research. Publications should show evidence of significant progress in the development of an independent and productive research program beyond the dissertation. A substantial proportion of these publications should be in nationally recognized, peer-reviewed journals or invited book chapters. These works constitute the core of an acceptable publication record. A book constituting original research in a recognized area of philosophical inquiry published by a nationally recognized press would also constitute the core of a tenurable research record. Book reviews and encyclopedia entries, no matter how numerous, are by themselves not considered to be evidence of significant research activity. Textbooks and innovative instructional materials having significant value beyond this campus will normally be considered as components of the candidate's teaching record. In cases where there is recognition that the textbook has made original scholarly contributions to the body of philosophical research, it can be considered a contribution to the candidate's research record.

Adequate, or even excellent, research in the absence of documented quality teaching and an appropriate level of service is not sufficient for the granting of promotion and/or the awarding of tenure.

b. Promotion to Full Professorial Rank. Candidates for promotion to full Professorial rank should demonstrate outstanding accomplishment in research, teaching, and service to their profession.

A candidate's research should show continuing accomplishment and should have achieved a substantial reputation among peer-group scholars outside this university. Promotion to Professor should be based on scholarship completed and published after promotion to Associate Professor, the significance of which has been certified by its reception within appropriate scholarly circles at the national or international level.

A candidate should demonstrate a strong and sustained record of teaching effectiveness. No one should be promoted to Professor if he/she/they has demonstrated a disregard for students or a disinclination to correct teaching deficiencies.

A candidate's professional service should be of considerably higher quality than that expected for promotion to Associate Professor. The candidate should have assumed a large role in the academic leadership of the School, and perhaps in the College and University as well. The candidate should also have developed broad professional connections. The School Committee's decision on promotion to Professor should include a careful assessment of the professional standing of the candidate.

Section B. History Program Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure

The History Program will operate within the promotion and tenure provisions of the collective bargaining agreement between the SIUC Faculty Association and the Board of Trustees of Southern Illinois University.

Promotion

A. Procedures

1. The Director compiles an up-to-date curriculum vitae for each promotion candidate and provides copies to all members of the appropriate Committee on Promotion. The candidate's publications, teaching evaluations, and other pertinent documentation are also made available to the Committee. If a favorable recommendation is tentatively made for promotion, the Director and the candidate may compile a dossier of supporting documentation including letters from SIUC colleagues and from appropriate outside scholars evaluating the scholarship of the candidate and make it available to the Committee.
2. A candidate will have the choice regarding whether letters from outside scholars evaluating scholarship are open, confidential but not anonymous, or confidential and anonymous. A signed form indicating the candidate's choice will be included in the dossier, and that choice will be made clear in the Director's request letter to potential reviewers. In compiling a list of possible reviewers, the Director asks the faculty member to submit up to six names, and the Director asks one or two experts in the candidate's field to submit up to six names. The Director shows the department's list to the candidate and allows her/him to veto up to two names that are inappropriate or unacceptable. The Director then composes a list of at least three names for promotion to associate professor and three names for early promotion or promotion to full, with half coming from the candidate's list and half from the department's list.
3. All decisions are made by a simple majority vote. All committee deliberations shall be conducted in confidence. The Program Personnel Committee shall vote by secret ballot. The vote of the Program Personnel Committee shall be recorded as the primary vote in the School Director's recommendation letter to the Dean. The School faculty vote shall be recorded as the secondary and subordinate vote in the School Director's recommendation letter to the Dean.

4. The Committee's recommendation will be reported to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts.

B. Criteria

1. Evaluation of candidates' teaching, research, and service will be commensurate with their assignments.

2. Effectiveness in teaching. Teaching performance will be evaluated on both the graduate and undergraduate levels and will include individualized instruction (theses, dissertations, readings, tutorials, and supervising teaching assistants) as well as scheduled courses taught, and cooperative or interdepartmental teaching (such as the honors program). Teaching effectiveness will be considered using student course evaluations, peer review, and other appropriate evidence, including teaching awards and student achievements. A faculty member has the option of not submitting course evaluations if less than 50 percent of the students in a particular class have completed the evaluations.

3. Research activity and publication.

a. In making its recommendation, the Committee will consider primarily research projects that have resulted in publication or acceptance for publication in the form of books, articles in refereed journals, or chapters in multi-authored texts.

b. The Committee will also consider teaching-oriented scholarship published in textbooks, anthologies, and magazines or newsletters. Research activity may also be evidenced by the organization of or participation in the programs of scholarly conventions, conferences, and seminars; efforts to obtain research grants; editing scholarly journals; refereeing manuscripts; book reviews; and involvement in public history activities such as public lectures and history day competitions. Other types of peer-reviewed scholarly products can also be considered. Faculty members may also submit evidence of work in progress.

c. Keeping in mind the ongoing scholarly, technological, and financial transformations in academia and academic publishing, along with the AHA guidelines for the evaluation of excellence in scholarship in the field of history, the History faculty at the School of History and Philosophy, recognize(s) two main paths for the fulfilment of research requirements for tenure and promotion. In order to advance from assistant to associate professor with tenure, the publication of either a scholarly monograph with a university or other scholarly press, or four to six scholarly articles/chapters in peer-reviewed academic journals or in peer-reviewed edited collections of articles (published by a scholarly press). If the book route is chosen, the monograph should be in-press (when all the editorial work has been completed on the accepted monograph) along with a letter from the press confirming the date of publication, at the time of the evaluation. An advanced book contract, which is preliminary and conditional, does not suffice to fulfill the research requirement. In the case of the article route, a significant number of the four to six

articles should be published in well-regarded scholarly journals (or their equivalent). Articles published before the candidate is hired as tenure-track assistant at SIU can count toward promotion and tenure, but the candidate should have a continued record of quality publications after their hire into the SIU History program, as reflected in the targeted range of four to six. The article/chapter publications may not consist solely from chapters published in edited volumes. The candidate may request the consideration of other work such as a major creative work, a major translated work, or several essays published in periodicals, in lieu of one article requirement.

d. In determining eligibility for promotion to full professor the Committee will require evidence of major research activity and publication, and a substantial reputation among their peer-group of scholars outside the University. A faculty member may apply for promotion to full professor after having served at the rank of associate professor for the requisite period of years, per SIU policy, provided the said faculty has fulfilled the teaching, research, and service criteria for advancement to full professor. The publication of either a monograph or three to four scholarly articles/chapters in peer-reviewed academic journals or peer-reviewed edited volumes (published by a scholarly/significant press) is required. Some overlap of research between publications at the rank of assistant professor and associate professor is understandable and even expected, but the new work must be more than a reiteration of the previous scholarship, as determined by the Committee and external reviewers of the dossier.

4. Service. The Committee will consider service to the History Program in the form of committees and administrative duties, to the University in the form of substantial contributions to the work of University councils, committees, and student organizations, and to the academic profession in the form of major service to scholarly journals and professional organizations, and in a professional capacity to the community.

Tenure

A. Procedures

1. Meetings of the Committee on Retention and Tenure (which include all tenured members of the Full Faculty of the Program) require a quorum of two-thirds of its members. Proxy voting is not permitted. All decisions are made by a simple majority vote.

The progress of tenure-track faculty is reviewed each year by the Committee on Tenure and Retention. Updated vitas for tenure-track faculty are provided to members of the Committee. They also have access to course evaluations, publications, and other pertinent documentation. The result of this annual review--normally an indication that a faculty member's progress toward tenure is satisfactory or unsatisfactory--is reported to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and to the individual tenure-track faculty. An unfavorable review may result in non-reappointment.

2. If a favorable annual review is made nearing the end of the probationary period, the Director and the candidate may compile a dossier of supporting documentation including letters from SIUC colleagues and from appropriate outside scholars evaluating the scholarship of the candidate and make it available to the Committee. The application for tenure is typically made at the beginning of the sixth year of service at SIUC. However, a faculty member may apply for tenure early, in their fourth year, if they have a particularly strong file. The candidate's specific contract with the university may modify this timetable.

3. A candidate will have the choice regarding whether letters from outside scholars evaluating scholarship are open, confidential but not anonymous, or confidential and anonymous. A signed form indicating the candidate's choice will be included in the dossier, and that choice will be made clear in the Director's request letter to potential reviewers. During the spring semester preceding the academic year in which the candidate is under review for promotion and/or tenure, the candidate shall provide to the School Director a list of appropriate outside reviewers of the candidate's research. In compiling a list of possible reviewers, the Director asks the faculty member to submit names, and the Chair asks one or two experts in the candidate's field to submit names. The Director shows the department's list to the candidate and allows her/him to veto up to two names that are inappropriate or unacceptable. The Director then composes a list of at least four names if the candidate is an assistant professor and at least four names if the candidate is an associate professor or full professor, with half coming from the candidate's list and half from the department's list.

4. A final recommendation for the grant or denial of tenure to a faculty member must be made by the Committee at the end of the probationary period appropriate for the faculty member's rank and after the dossier is completed. An early recommendation on tenure before the end of the probationary period may be initiated **in writing** by the tenure-track faculty member.

If the Committee recommends a denial of tenure, the faculty member must be notified in writing within the time period specified in the collective bargaining agreement between the SIUC Faculty Association and the Board.

5. The Committee's recommendation will be reported to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts.

B. Criteria

1. Evaluation of candidates -- teaching, research, and service will be commensurate with their assignments.

2. Effectiveness in teaching: Teaching performance will be evaluated on both the graduate and undergraduate levels and will include individualized instruction (theses, dissertations, readings, tutorials, and supervising teaching assistants) as well as scheduled courses taught, and cooperative or interdepartmental teaching (such as the honors program). Teaching effectiveness will be considered using student course evaluations, peer review, and other appropriate evidence, including teaching awards and student achievements.

3. Research activity: The Committee will consider the publications of the faculty member eligible for tenure and other evidence of research activity such as applications for grants, manuscripts in progress, and participation in programs of scholarly meetings.

4. Service: The Committee will consider service to the Program and/or School on committees or discharging administrative duties, to the university at large, either as a member of committees and councils or work with student organizations, and activities related to professional organizations or professional service to the community

Section C. Philosophy Program Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure

Philosophy Program guidelines for the awarding of tenure and for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor or to full professorial rank shall be consistent with guidelines published in the current version of the *Faculty and Administrative Professional Staff Handbook* of the University and the “College of Liberal Arts Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure Recommendations.” These documents are available from the College of Liberal Arts.

The School Director is responsible for regular review of all faculty eligible for tenure and promotion, following timelines and guidelines established by the policies of the University, the College of Liberal Arts, and the School of History and Philosophy. The School Director shall consult an appropriately constituted tenure or promotion committee (hereinafter referred to as a “Personnel Committee”) before transmitting a tenure or promotion recommendation to the Dean.

The Philosophy Program’s Personnel Committee for a tenure decision shall consist of all tenured faculty in the Philosophy Program. The Program Personnel Committee for a promotion decision shall consist of all faculty in the Philosophy Program senior in rank to the candidate.

All committee deliberations shall be conducted in confidence. The Program Personnel Committee shall vote by secret ballot. The vote of the Program Personnel Committee shall be recorded as the primary vote in the School Director’s recommendation letter to the Dean. The School faculty vote shall be recorded as the secondary and subordinate vote in the School Director’s recommendation letter to the Dean.

In the case of a candidate who is under final review for tenure (or promotion and tenure, in the case of a candidate who is an Assistant Professor) and who has not elected to withdraw his or her name as specified below, the candidate’s dossier shall be forwarded to the Dean for review and action regardless of whether the recommendations of the Personnel Committee and the School Director are positive or negative.

In the case of a tenured member of the faculty who is being considered for promotion, and in the case of an untenured member of the faculty who is being considered for early tenure and/or promotion, if both the School Director and the Personnel Committee do not

recommend tenure and/or promotion, then the candidate's dossier will not be forwarded to the Dean for further consideration on that matter unless the candidate so requests.

At any point in the process, however, a candidate for promotion and/or tenure may elect by written request to withdraw his or her name from further consideration.

1. *Mentoring Responsibility.* The Program Coordinator is responsible for mentoring and advising all faculty in new tenure-track appointments. When a new tenure-track appointment is made, a Mentoring Committee (a one- or two-person subcommittee of the appropriate Personnel Committee) shall be appointed by the Program Coordinator in consultation with the new faculty member and the prospective committee member(s). Service on this committee shall be voluntary, and changes in membership should be made when appropriate. The Mentoring Committee is strictly advisory; its goal is to facilitate the candidate's professional development and progress towards tenure and promotion.

In the first years of a new appointment, the Program Coordinator assisted by the Mentoring Committee shall consult with the new faculty member, as appropriate, on matters related to professional development and the tenure/promotion process (e.g., general strategies for success, selection of appropriate journals, and setting priorities). In addition, the Program Coordinator assisted by the Mentoring Committee should help and encourage the candidate to begin constructing a tenure dossier, and should advise the candidate on appropriate materials to include.

During the year preceding the academic year in which the candidate is scheduled for review for promotion and/or tenure, the Program Coordinator assisted by the Mentoring Committee shall advise the candidate, as appropriate, on various aspects of dossier preparation, including required features of the dossier, the basic university format, and appropriate ways to present evidence of success in teaching, research, and service.

2. *Candidate Rights and Responsibilities.* Ultimate responsibility for any candidate's record of research, teaching, and service lies with the candidate. Correspondingly, and in accordance with stated University policy (see "Promotion Policies and Procedures: Faculty" in the *Faculty and Administrative Professional Staff Handbook*) candidates shall have the right to assemble their own dossiers, providing any evidence they think will strengthen their cases, subject to the general constraints outlined in the appropriate university, college, school, and program documents. In addition, members of the Program shall have the right to ask the appropriate committee to consider them for promotion and/or tenure. The candidate's responsibilities include the following:

a. The candidate should keep relevant materials in anticipation of tenure and promotion decisions. Relevant materials may include such items as syllabi, examinations, grant proposals, reprints of published work, teaching evaluations or evaluation summaries, copies of reviews, solicited and unsolicited letters, and similar items. This list is not intended to be exhaustive, nor is each of its items required.

b. During the spring semester preceding the academic year in which the candidate is under review for promotion and/or tenure, the candidate shall provide to the School Director a list of appropriate outside reviewers of the candidate's research.

c. The candidate shall provide to the School Director materials to be copied and sent to outside reviewers. Materials shall include a current vitae and representative publications.

d. The candidate, with the advice of the Mentoring Committee and the support of the School Director and secretarial staff, shall assemble a dossier which shall be made available to members of the Personnel Committee sufficiently prior to their vote on the tenure and/or promotion of the candidate to allow them to examine the materials. When it is made available to the Personnel Committee, the dossier may or may not be in the form in which it will be sent to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts. For example, the candidate may wish to place materials regarding research, teaching, and service in separate folders for examination by the Personnel Committee and may include additional materials that are not sent forward to the Dean in the final dossier, such as sample syllabi, discursive course evaluations, and unpublished manuscripts. In any case, sufficient materials should be presented to the Personnel Committee to allow them to make an informed decision regarding the candidate's tenure and/or promotion. Such materials should include, at a minimum: a complete vitae; copies of all publications; quantitative and qualitative evidence of teaching effectiveness over a representative range of courses the candidate has taught at this university; copies of all letters solicited from outside reviewers (with the exception of letters that are unduly late).

e. The candidate shall work with the School Director to assemble a final dossier to be sent to the Dean subsequent to the vote of the Personnel Committee regarding the candidate's promotion and/or tenure. This dossier shall include the School Director's letter and the report of the vote of the Personnel Committee, and shall follow all required university, college, school, and program guidelines for the construction of dossiers.

3. *Materials to be included in the candidate's dossier.*

a. *Basic Information.* See the required university format for dossiers in the *Faculty and Administrative Professional Staff Handbook*.

b. The *curriculum vitae*. The basic descriptive document forming a dossier is a complete *curriculum vitae*. The *curriculum vitae* should follow the form established by the College of Liberal Arts.

c. *School Director's Letter of Recommendation.*

d. *Evidence and Evaluation Regarding Quality of Teaching.* At the beginning of each section of evidence there should be a brief introduction to the section, e.g., in this section there may be a brief statement of teaching philosophy. It is also helpful to include a list of courses taught during the period since the candidate was hired (in the case of tenure) or since the last review (in the case of promotion). Moreover, this section should include multiple indicators of teaching effectiveness, including a

quantitative summary of student evaluations of at least a representative range of courses the candidate has taught at this university.

In addition to the quantitative summary of student evaluations, reactions of colleagues and students that may be considered include: (a) letters from students and student comments on evaluation forms; (b) receipt of awards for outstanding teaching, (c) opinions of other members of the candidate's discipline, particularly if based on class visitations or on attendance at public lectures or lectures before professional societies given by the candidate, (d) number and caliber of students guided in research by the candidate or attracted to the University by the candidate's reputation as scholar and teacher, and (e) evidence of effective learning, such as mastery of material by students taught by the candidate in courses prerequisite to those of the informant. Other forms of student and/or colleague reaction may also be appropriate. For example, a candidate might present evidence based on pre-test/post-test comparisons or other performance measures indicating that the amount of student learning of the material in the candidate's classes has been particularly high. Similarly, if the candidate's colleagues consider the candidate a catalyst for the initiation of new approaches to teaching in their own courses, this should also be noted.

Prepared materials that are relevant to the assessment of teaching include course syllabi and examinations. Qualitative judgments may include an assessment of the care with which instructional materials, such as texts, have been selected; use of instructional aids such as films; and appropriate use of the course format. One focus of concern should be on the quality of mind brought to bear on the enterprise of teaching. Also, to be considered under prepared materials is any record of the development of techniques or modes of instruction, including substantial revision of existing courses or development of new courses. Textbooks authored by the candidate can also constitute a significant contribution to teaching. A proposal for a grant for curriculum development, if successful, may also be considered as an instance of prepared materials when the grant project aims toward improvement in instruction.

The section regarding teaching or the Director's letter should indicate the sources of evidence on which the appraisal of teaching competence has been based. Surveys of student opinion of teaching are valuable but should be supplemented by other forms of evaluation. Student evaluations should be interpreted by the Director in the School Director's Letter of Recommendation. Thus, if a particular instructor's teaching load for a period of time consisted principally of generally unpopular required courses or if there was a particularly significant event in a given semester that might have influenced student opinion, such facts should be made known. In addition, if the student evaluations of a particular instructor's teaching of generally unpopular required courses is significantly higher or lower than that of other members of the Program, these facts should also be made known.

e. Evidence and Evaluation Regarding Research. At the beginning of this section of evidence there should be a brief overview of past and future research, i.e., a research statement. In addition, this section must include the letters from outside reviewers and the School Director's ratings of all the venues of the candidate's research (e.g.,

publishers, journals, conferences, etc.) that is to be considered for purposes of the review.

An analytical summary of the research or creative record is useful and can be persuasive in making a case. This kind of summary analysis, however, should not be considered a substitute for qualitative judgment. Counting and sorting publications is not the same as evaluating their quality, and the evaluation is what is important.

A few works of high quality are more important than numerous insignificant works. Evaluation of the quality of research requires attention to whether the work is that of a single author and if not, the percentage of contribution from each individual; the quality of the publication venue; whether the work is an integral part of an ongoing research or creative program; whether the work demonstrates promise of impact and continuing work; whether the work reveals evidence of significant post-doctoral research; and how the work is regarded by peers in the field.

The standards and status of scholarly presses and journals vary considerably. Therefore, each dossier should contain a discussion of the quality of the press or journals in which the scholarly work appears, e.g., standing in the discipline or subdiscipline, acceptance rates, critical standards, and readership.

Reviews, citations, and appraisals in the publications of others should be taken as significant testimony of the quality of the candidate's work. The record of research grant proposals and fellowships applied for and awarded should be examined and interpreted. A positive pattern of professional development as scholar should be demonstrated.

Original work should be considered as evidence only after acceptance for publication. A given achievement should not be counted as an accomplishment justifying advancement of a faculty member if it has been employed in earlier justifications, except in the obvious sense of counting as part of a cumulative record. In cases where a scholarly work has appreciated in stature and importance after its initial publication, evidence of such appreciation should be demonstrated by means of reviews, anthologies, and significant citations. Such evidence may be considered in context for subsequent promotion decisions.

f. *Outside letters of evaluation of research.* Letters of evaluation from scholars outside the university with recognized distinction in the candidate's field of specialization shall be required in all cases of tenure or promotion. Unless the candidate requests otherwise, all outside reviewers should be broadly within the candidate's tradition in philosophy, and in every case reviewers should be clearly qualified to assess the candidate's research. Outside reviewers should be faculty members of peer universities and should be at, or above, the rank being considered for promotion. The value of outside letters depends on the choice of appropriate persons who are discriminating judges and who are familiar with the candidate's work or will take the trouble to study it. Letters from the candidate's major professor, or the candidate's graduate student colleagues, are generally less persuasive to a case than more clearly objective sources and should therefore, as a rule, be avoided.

However, it is expected that some of the reviewers will be known by the candidate. Copies of outside letters and an evaluation of the credentials of the referees should accompany the dossier. Further, a copy of the letter soliciting the external evaluation (or an explanation in the Director's letter of the procedure followed) should be included as part of the dossier.

g. Evidence and Evaluation Regarding Service. At the beginning of this section of evidence there should be a brief introduction to the section, i.e., a list of service activities. Candidates should avoid unnecessary "padding" in the dossier generally, but especially in this section. When documenting service, emphasis should be given to other than routine program or college activities; a list of routine service activities at the beginning of the section normally suffices.

Service is expected of all faculty as part of the normal performance of duties and should be taken into account in making an overall assessment of an individual's qualifications for advancement. Service on College and University committees will not normally be expected of non-tenured, tenure-track faculty.

Some examples of service to be considered are effective academic advising of students; discipline, college, or university committee work, particularly involving authorship of reports that subsequently are adopted as policy; special assignments undertaken at the request of the administration such as curriculum development projects; Chairpersonships; work with student organizations or initiatives of students; professional consulting activity; honorific membership or leadership in scholarly societies; leadership in national professional associations; professional editorial assignment for national refereed journals or for scholarly publishers; and honors and special recognition awarded.

4. Program Standards for Promotion and Tenure

a. Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure. Quality and quantity of published scholarly research are both important indicators of research productivity. There must be a sufficient quantity of published work in order for there to be an evaluation of general quality of the candidate's research. Publications should show evidence of significant progress in the development of an independent and productive research program beyond the dissertation. A substantial proportion of these publications should be in nationally recognized, peer-reviewed journals or invited book chapters. These works constitute the core of an acceptable publication record. A book constituting original research in a recognized area of philosophical inquiry published by a nationally recognized press would also constitute the core of a tenurable research record. Book reviews and encyclopedia entries, no matter how numerous, are by themselves not considered to be evidence of significant research activity. Textbooks and innovative instructional materials having significant value beyond this campus will normally be considered as components of the candidate's teaching record. In cases where there is recognition that the textbook has made original scholarly contributions to the body of philosophical research, it can be considered a contribution to the candidate's research record.

Adequate, or even excellent, research in the absence of documented quality teaching and an appropriate level of service is not sufficient for the granting of promotion and/or the awarding of tenure.

b. *Promotion to Full Professorial Rank.* Candidates for promotion to full Professorial rank should demonstrate outstanding accomplishment in research, teaching, and service to their profession.

A candidate's research should show continuing accomplishment, and should have achieved a substantial reputation among peer-group scholars outside this university. Promotion to Professor should be based on scholarship completed and published after promotion to Associate Professor, the significance of which has been certified by its reception within appropriate scholarly circles at the national or international level.

A candidate should demonstrate a strong and sustained record of teaching effectiveness. No one should be promoted to Professor if he or she has demonstrated a disregard for students or a disinclination to correct teaching deficiencies, or if there is a continuing record of mediocre or negative teaching evaluations by students and faculty peers.

A candidate's professional service should be of considerably higher quality than that expected for promotion to Associate Professor. The candidate should have assumed a strong role in the academic leadership of the Program, and perhaps in the College and University as well. The candidate should also have developed broad professional connections. The Program decision on promotion to Professor should include a careful assessment of the professional standing of the candidate.

Article VI: Workload

Faculty workloads shall be assigned by the Director, in consultation with the faculty member, and in accordance with the current Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), university policies, and this operating paper. The workload assignment provides guidance to each faculty member about expectations for duties and responsibilities for the academic year.

A. Faculty workloads may consist of teaching (both direct and indirect), research/creative activities, and service.

1. Teaching

a. Direct teaching includes classroom instruction for courses with assigned credit hours in all teaching formats (including face-to-face, virtual, and hybrid).

b. Indirect teaching includes, but is not limited to, supervision of theses or other independent study projects, course development, general mentoring and advising of students (including assisting students in preparing for graduate school or job applications), and serving as reader on thesis or dissertation committees. See also Article X, Indirect Teaching.

2. Research/Creative Activity includes, but is not limited to, conducting research, writing, presenting, and publishing research in scholarly outlets, including books, journal articles, conference proceedings, and edited journals and volumes with respect to the fields of History and Philosophy.

3. Service work includes service to the unit, to the school, to the university, and to the field. Examples of service work include, but are not limited to, coordination of curricular areas, completing required university-wide training, serving on school or university wide-committees, reviewing student applications, reviewing abstracts or manuscripts for conferences or journals, student advising, supervision of a registered student organization, and organization of and participation in recruiting or educational events.

B. Workloads shall be equitably distributed to faculty and take into consideration the preferences and expertise of faculty, as well as school and student needs with respect to their fields.

C. The basis for percentage assignments in service and indirect teaching shall be the time required, by a qualified faculty member working reasonably efficiently, to do the work required for a given assignment. For example, a service task assigned 10% of a faculty member's workload should require, on average, 3.75 hours per week to complete (assuming the standard 37.5-hour workweek). It is understood that service and indirect teaching tasks may not be evenly distributed through the semester or academic year so weekly time requirements may vary. A faculty member who believes their assigned service and indirect teaching duties cannot be completed within the averaged time allocated should consult with the Director.

1. TT Faculty: TT faculty are expected to be active in research, service, and indirect teaching in addition to their direct teaching duties. To allow them workload space for such activities, the standard teaching load for TT faculty shall be two courses (6 credit hours) a semester (or four courses [12 credit hours] per academic year). The Director shall be particularly cognizant of the need to ensure that untenured TT faculty have an adequate workload assignment for research.

2. NTT faculty: Full-time NTT teaching eight courses (24 credit hours) per academic year shall not be assigned service and indirect teaching work. Full-time NTT faculty who are expected to be active in service and/or indirect teaching, in addition to their direct teaching duties, shall be assigned no more than seven courses (21 credit hours) per academic year.

D. Service Compensation and Course Releases: Assigned service or indirect teaching duties that require considerably more work than a standard service and indirect teaching assignment shall normally be offset with a course release, summer salary, or both. An NTT faculty member already assigned service and indirect teaching could thereby qualify for an additional course release (i.e., a direct teaching assignment of eighteen credit hours per academic year).

Additionally, faculty may receive occasional course releases to support ongoing research projects. Such releases shall prioritize pre-tenure faculty on tenure-track appointments. Releases may also be granted to faculty with a past history of research excellence and a clearly defined present need for additional research time.

Each spring, upon finalization of faculty workloads, the Director shall report to the faculty on all course releases assigned to school faculty for the upcoming year, noting in each case the service assignment that is covered by the release. In the event the Director assigns a course release after initial assignments of duties, the Director shall report that release, and the

corresponding service assignment, in a timely fashion. The following service positions shall normally qualify for a course release or other service compensation each year.

1. Undergraduate Program Coordinators. The Director, in consultation with the Full Faculty will appoint an Undergraduate Program Coordinator. The Coordinator's duties include (a) assisting in furthering the overall mission of the School, (b) serving on the Steering Committee, and (c) supporting and organizing recruitment, retention, and outreach activities, including coordination with undergraduate advising and curricular sections and responding to student and faculty queries regarding undergraduate programs. As the Undergraduate Program Coordinator position is a service role, not an Administrative Professional position, the duties of the Undergraduate Program Coordinator shall not include fiscal responsibilities, administrative reporting, or other duties requiring administrative authority.

2. Graduate Studies Coordinators. The Director, in consultation with the faculty represented within the Program, will appoint two Graduate Program Coordinators, one from the faculty of each Program, History and Philosophy, whose duties include, but are not limited to, serving on the steering committee, coordinating acceptance and assistantship offers with relevant Program faculty and the Director; coordinating with the Graduate School for admissions, progress tracking, and graduation; coordinating with TA supervisors to provide fall orientation; and initial advisement in coordination with section heads. As the Graduate Studies Coordinator is a service role, not an Administrative Professional position, the duties of the position shall not include fiscal responsibilities, administrative reporting, or other duties requiring administrative authority.

E. Workload Reporting. Each spring before the final assignments of faculty workloads, the Director shall, after consultation with the Steering Committee, share a draft document that lays out a plan for equitable distribution of labor, creating a plan for standard expectations for faculty activity in service and indirect teaching.

1. The expectations document may include standard percentage assignments for faculty indirect teaching and service, with examples of normal expectations for work in each area.

2. A draft expectations document shall be made available for faculty comment at least one week before a School meeting at which it shall be an agenda item for discussion. Following the meeting, the Director shall then publish the final version of the document which will guide workload assignments for the following academic year.

F. Nothing in this document shall prohibit a faculty member from voluntarily teaching more courses than those listed on their initial workload assignment or taking on additional teaching or service work. Any faculty who are interested in taking on additional work after their original assignment of duties for a given year may request that such work be added to their workloads, but such work only becomes an assigned duty with the approval of the Director. Any approved changes to workload shall be reflected in a revised workload assignment.

G. In the event the Director believes a TT Faculty member's work in research, service, and/or indirect teaching over the course of an academic year did not justify limiting the direct teaching assignment to 50% in a given year, the Director must inform the faculty member of this in writing and discuss it with them before duties are assigned for the subsequent

academic year. The two parties shall work to create a mutually agreeable plan of action to address this situation for the subsequent academic year.

1. In the event the Director finds that the TT Faculty member's research, service, and/or teaching work for the subsequent year also did not justify that year's workload assignment, the Director shall notify the Faculty member of this in writing and discuss the matter with them before assigning a workload for the following year. The two parties shall again endeavor to agree on a mutually agreeable plan of action for the following year with respect to their field. In the event the faculty member and SHP administration cannot reach an agreement, a range of options shall be considered on a case-by-case basis with an emphasis on promoting successful research activity in the ensuing year.

Article VII. Indirect Teaching.

The School Director shall make workload assignments for tenured and tenure-track Faculty in accordance with the Workload article of the current Collective Bargaining Agreement with the SIUC Faculty Association, with specific credits for Indirect Teaching in accordance with the following chart.

A. Credit Hour Equivalencies for Indirect (i.e., non-classroom) Teaching.

Indirect Teaching	Credit Hour Equivalency
Undergraduate Directed Reading (HIST 490) (PHIL 491)	0.5
Senior Thesis (HIST 499) (PHIL 499)	1
Individual Research Paper/Honors Paper	0.3
Supervision of Awarded Undergraduate Assistantship (e.g., REACH, McNair)	1
Master's Thesis Director, completed thesis	2
Non-directing Member of a Master's thesis committee, completed thesis	0.5
Master's Exam reader	0.2
Supervision of Teaching for Graduate Students (HIST 597) (PHIL 553)	0.2
Readings in History (HIST 590) (PHIL 591)	0.5
General Prelim Exam Reader	0.2
Special Area Exam Reader	0.2
Non-directing member of dissertation committee, completed dissertation	1
Dissertation Director, completed dissertation	3

Article VIII -- Amendments

Amendments to the Operating Papers for the School of History and Philosophy will be proposed at a School meeting and voted upon by Full Faculty by written ballot another day. Approval requires a two-thirds majority of those voting.

APPENDIX A

GUIDELINES FOR THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON MERIT PAY SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY CARBONDALE

Recommendations for merit salary increases in the History Program are made by the Director with advice from the Advisory Committee on Merit Pay and submitted to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts. Advisory Committee members are elected in accordance with the provisions of the History Program Operating Paper and are guided in their recommendations by the following merit plan.

Preamble:

The SIUC History Program in the Fall of 2000 is adopting this plan for determining merit ratios for salary increases in order to acknowledge the efforts of its members in the areas of teaching, research, and service. It recognizes that this plan neither addresses the inequities that are endemic to the current salary structure nor tries to remedy those inequities, which is the responsibility of the SIU Board of Trustees and its representatives to correct. The Program advocates a system that addresses both the inequities among Program members (compression) and the inequities between those members and their colleagues in history departments at peer institutions (parity).

Principles:

1. **clarity** - with respect to structure
2. **acknowledgment** - of work done in all three areas: teaching, research and service
3. **flexibility** - with respect to channeling efforts
4. **cost of living component** - is built into the merit plan, by awarding points for routine, assigned duties
5. **differential weighting** - teaching and research are weighted more than service, but research is still given more weight than teaching
6. **work in progress** - this merit plan should be seen as an evolving document-one that is to be reviewed periodically, and changed if necessary.

Procedures:

1. Each faculty member will assemble details concerning his/her teaching, research, and service activities for a given year for review by the Advisory Committee at least two weeks before its first meeting. The Director will also make available information on faculty assignments. The Committee may also request copies of publications, papers, teaching evaluations, and other evidence of professional effort.

2. Contributions in teaching, research, and service will be carefully considered for each individual faculty member, and his or her performance will be evaluated according to the merit plan's point system (see below) in each of these three categories of endeavor.
3. Merit considerations will be linked to assignment in all three areas. Faculty will not be held accountable for activities not in their assignment.
4. Department members are ranked in relation to each other, based on productivity, and awarded a merit ratio derived from the raw score established by the merit plan.
5. Individual committee members will assign tentative points to each faculty member's activities before the committee meeting. The committee will use these data in determining final points. No committee member will participate in deliberations concerning his/her own salary.
6. The Committee deliberations will be kept confidential. The final points sheets and faculty forms will be kept in the department office.
7. The Committee will report promptly to each faculty member both his/her total points and merit ratio. This will be public information distributed to all faculty members.

8. Merit Ratio Mechanics:

- < the average of the department members' total points is computed
- < each member's score is divided by the departmental average to obtain a provisional merit ratio
- < no one will be credited with a merit ratio above 1.5 or less than .75. All first year tenure-track faculty will receive a minimum merit ratio of 1. (For example, if the merit component of the raise is 5%, no one will get more than 7.5% or less than 3.75%, and a first year tenure track faculty member would receive at least 5%).
- < if the total raise for the department is 3% or less, all faculty members will receive a merit ratio of 1.
- < Merit raises will be figured as a percentage of each person's salary.
- < In accordance with University policy, the Director will ensure that in the case of a faculty member exhibiting poor performance or failing to meet professional responsibilities, little or no merit salary increase will be awarded.

Point System

TEACHING

Courses Taught B (list all courses: fall, spring, and summer terms, ILP, and Honors.

4 courses a year - 10 to 14 points per course

1st extra course over 4 - 20 points

other extra courses - 10 to 14 points

HIST 392 - 14 points

new colloquium - 14 points

summer courses - 10-14 points

New Prep (lecture) - 12 pts.

Instructional Innovation - 1 to 15 pts.

Individualized Instruction - (readings, tutorials, independent study, HIST 492--specify number of students and nature of work if not clear) - 1 pt. per student, regardless of credit hours

Guest Lectures - 1 pt. for 6 or more in a year

Supervisor Completed Master's Thesis - 4 pts.

Supervisor Completed Dissertation - 12 pts.

Chair, Completed Master's Committee (no thesis) - 2 pts.

Member Completed Master's Committee (indicate whether thesis or 2-paper option) - 1 pt.

Member Completed Dissertation Committee - 3 pts.

Member Completed Comp/Prelim Exam Committee - 1 pt.

GA Discussion Leader Supervision (indicate # of GA s and type of supervision) - 2 pts. per GA; 1 pt. per Grader

GA Training Workshops - 1 to 3 pts.

Publications

articles, pamphlets, essays - 2 to 20 pts.

book - 25 to 50 pts.

Awards or Grants (include those declined)

internal P.I. - 1 to 5 - 1 pt. dept./USG; 3pts. college; 5 pts. SIUC/Core
external P.I. - 5 to 20 pts.
participant or content specialist - 1 to 15 pts.

Other Teaching Activity

RESEARCH

Books (Co-authored books receive same points as single authored; take into account prestige of press and quality of reception; all books to be evaluated each year for **three** years)

Monograph - 75 to 100 - 85 pts. is standard; 100 pts. the year a book gets a prize

Edited Book of Primary Documents or Essays; Translated Book

50 to 75 - A collection or edition of print materials or scholarly essays requiring editorial and authorial contributions in English, or a straightforward translation of a modern work

75 to 100 - An edition of original source materials transcribed from manuscript and requiring substantial scholarly apparatus and/or translation into English from another language

Textbook - 25 to 50 pts.

Articles/Chapters

Article in national/international peer-reviewed journal - 40 to 50 pts.

Article in field-specific peer-reviewed journal - 30 to 50 pts.

Article in peer-reviewed regional and state journals - 20 to 25 pts.

Article in non-peer reviewed publication - 5 to 50 pts. (some of the leading foreign journals do not do peer review, but should be considered in the 40 to 50 range)

Book Chapter/Essay - 20 to 50 pts. (note quality of press)

Published Conference Proceedings (journal issue/book) - 5 to 35 (consider if every paper is published or whether only certain papers are selected for publication)

Major Essay in Significant Encyclopedia - 5 to 50 pts.

Brief Essay in Encyclopedia (250B1000 words) - 1 to 5 pts.

Book Review or Essay (substantial) - 3 to 15 pts., with 15 for a substantial review in a major journal (AHR...)

Book Review (500-1000 words) - 2 pts.

Book Review (up to 500 words) - 1 pt.

Editor of Special Journal Issue - 5 to 10 pts.

Other Works, print or electronic

Conference Presentations

Plenary Speaker (give conference details) B 5 to 20 pts.

Paper (differentiate conference by international major/minor, national major/minor, field-specific, regional, etc.) - 5 to 15 pts.

Commentator - 1 to 10 pts.
Other Conference Participation - 1 to 5 pts.
Other Presentations of Scholarship - 1 to 15 pts.

Grants and Awards

External Major grant or fellowship P.I. (including those declined) - 10 to 20 pts.
External Minor grant or fellowship P.I. (including those declined) - 5 to 10 pts.
Internal Grant P.I. - 1 to 5 pts.
Participant or content specialist - 1 to 15 pts.
Finalist for major grant or fellowship - 1 to 5 pts.
Scholarly awards and prizes - 1 to 15 pts. (consider whether internal or external)

Discipline Related Popular or Creative Works - 5 to 40 pts.

Research in Progress (with track record) - no points

Other Research Activity

SERVICE

Service points identified here assume an academic year. Divide points in half if your position/activity involved only one semester; for major positions such as Director position or President of the FA or Faculty Senate, itemize positions and activities that are a function of the job. Do not list these separately for merit points.

Program

Director of Graduate Studies - points for 1 course release + 20-25 pts. or points for 2 course releases + 10 pts.
Director of Undergraduate Studies - points for 1 course release + 20-25 or points for 2 course releases + 10 pts.
Coordinator, History Fair - points for 1 course release
Coordinator, History Workshop - 2 pts for 1 person; 1 pt. each if job shared
Advisor, Phi Alpha Theta - 5 pts.
Coordinator TA Training Workshop - 10 pts.; 5 pts. if co-coordinator
Member: Policy Committee, Grad Studies Committee, Undergrad Studies Committee, Search Committee - 2 pts.
Member: Other Committees (list) - 0 to 1 pt.
Other Program Service - 0 to 5 pts.

College/University

Member: COLA Council, Graduate Council, Faculty Senate - 2 to 4 pts.

Chair: COLA Council - 8 pts.

President: Graduate Council, Faculty Senate, Faculty Association - points for course release + 8 points, or no course release and 20 pts.

Officer or Chair of Committee: COLA Council, Graduate Council, Faculty Senate - 1 to 5 pts.

Task Force - member B 1 to 3 pts.; chair - 4 to 5 pts.

Internal Program Review Team – member - 1 to 3 pts; chair - 4 to 5 pts.

Search Committee - member B 1 to 3 pts.; chair - 4 to 5 pts.

Fellowship or Grants Committee - 1 to 3 pts.

School Representative, Faculty Association - 1 to 3 pts.

Officer or Chair of Committee, Faculty Association - 1 to 5 pts.

Other University Service - 0 to 10 pts.

Professional Service

Journal Editor (major/minor, indicate if co-editor) - 5 to 20 pts.

Other Editorial Position - 0 to 10 pts. (for example, book review editor for average journal 3 pts.

Member, Board of Editors (major/minor) - 0 to 10 pts.

Conference Program Committee - member - 1 to 5 pts.; chair - 5 to 10 pts.

Committee Member, Professional Association (major/minor) - member - 1 to 3 pts.; chair - 3 to 5 pts.

Officer, Professional Association (major/minor) - 3 to 10 pts.

Reviewer of Book or Journal Manuscript - 1 to 5 pts.

Grant/Fellowship Reviewer for Major External Agency - 5 pts.

Expert Consultation or Interview - 1 to 5 pts.

Professionally Oriented Community Service (please specify) - 1 to 2 pts.

External Reviewer for Tenure and Promotion Case - 2 pts.

Other Professional Service - 0 to 5 pts.