

BYLAWS OF THE HISTORY DEPARTMENT
UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON
(Revised July 2021)

Section I. Composition of the Department

The department shall consist of all faculty members holding continuing (not visiting) appointments as professors, associate professors, assistant professors, or instructional (or clinical) professors. All continuing faculty have voting rights, though these rights are restricted for tenure and promotion votes, as stipulated in Appendix I, “Tenure and Promotion Standards.” A faculty member with a joint appointment in another department shall have voting rights, if and only if said faculty member shall be reviewed or was reviewed for tenure and promotion in the History Department or is subject to annual merit review in the History Department. For the purposes of this document, references to “faculty” henceforth shall denote “faculty with voting rights,” which by definition excludes non-continuing faculty – such as visiting professors, post-doctoral fellows, and adjunct teaching faculty – and jointly-appointed faculty having only courtesy appointments in the History Department.

Section II. Meetings

Meetings of the department shall be held at least once a semester. Either the Chair or a majority of the departmental members in residence shall have authority to call special meetings of the department. Whenever possible the agenda for all meetings shall be circulated in advance.

The Chair (or any designated representative of the Chair) shall preside over all meetings of the department. At all meetings a quorum consisting of a majority of the departmental members in residence must be present. No votes shall be cast by proxy. Departmental action will be determined by a majority of those present and voting. In the absence of specific rules adopted by the department, the proceedings shall be conducted according to *Robert’s Rules of Order* (see Appendix VI for an abbreviated version of RRO). Minutes of departmental meetings shall be kept by the Chair or his/her designate and distributed to all members of the department. The taking of minutes shall be a responsibility rotated in alphabetical order among all members of the faculty.

The faculty of the department shall:

1. approve all degree programs, including requirements for admission and requirements for degrees;
2. approve areas to be filled (including new areas added) by appointment of full-time faculty;
3. approve all appointments to full-time faculty positions;
4. approve major policies or policy changes in the administration of departmental affairs;
5. approve all changes in courses and curriculum;
6. attend faculty meetings and provide service at the departmental level including standing committees as well as performing other college, university, and disciplinary service obligations upon request or election;

Section III. Officers of the Department and Departmental Committees

The Chair of the department shall serve for three years. Departmental nominations and elections for Chair shall be conducted according to college procedures.

The Chair shall:

1. represent the department in its relations with other units of the university;
2. administer the affairs of the department in accordance with the policies determined by the department, college, and university, including recommending committee appointments to the Executive Committee;
3. supervise the scheduling of classes, counseling, and registration of students, and assignment of graduate assistants and adjuncts to their duties;
4. manage the operation of the central office of the department;
5. prepare and manage the departmental budget;
6. recommend salary increments to the dean in accordance with procedures and criteria established by the department;
7. conduct negotiations for the hiring of new faculty members in cooperation with the search committee;
8. preside over departmental meetings and supervise the writing and distribution of departmental minutes;
9. conduct unofficial annual reviews of all Clinical, Assistant, and Associate Professors in order to help faculty in these ranks advance their careers as scholars and teachers (see Appendix II).
10. serve as chair of the Executive Committee and an *ex-officio* member of all standing committees;
11. maintain records on faculty participation in meetings and on all committees; and report to the Merit Committee chair patterns of nonparticipation.

The Director of Graduate Studies shall be appointed by the Chair of the department in consultation with the faculty. An Associate Director of Graduate Studies, also appointed by the Chair of the department in consultation with the faculty, will assist the Graduate Director in managing the graduate program. The terms of appointment shall coincide with that of the Chair.

The duties of the DGS include:

1. coordinating graduate admissions;
2. counseling history graduate students;
3. appointing thesis and dissertation committees and comprehensive exam committees;
4. administering the processing of announcements of graduate history programs and applications for fellowships, assistantships, and admission to graduate programs;
5. serving on the College level Graduate Committee;
6. consulting with the Department Chair about graduate courses offerings;
7. reporting each semester to the Chair, the Executive Committee, and the Department;
8. serving as chair of the departmental Graduate Committee.

The Director of Undergraduate Studies shall be appointed by the Chair of the department in consultation with the faculty. The term shall coincide with that of the Chair. The duties include:

1. organizing and directing the counseling of history undergraduate majors;

2. consulting with the Chair in the scheduling of courses;
3. organizing departmentally-based undergraduate activities and scholarships;
4. monitoring the number of undergraduate majors and working to maintain and enhance our undergraduate program;
5. serving on the College level Undergraduate Committee;
6. reporting each semester to the Chair, the Executive Committee; and the Department;
7. serving as chair of the departmental Undergraduate Committee.

The Technology and Library Director shall be appointed by the Chair of the department in consultation with the faculty. The term of appointment shall coincide with that of the Chair. The duties include:

1. coordinating with the chair and faculty in the decision-making in the areas of computer equipment, technology in the classroom and research, and classroom allocation and use;
2. coordinating with the library the use of funds for acquiring materials needed in history programs;
3. working with the library staff on matters affecting history faculty and students;
4. maintaining the department website and working with the committee to advertise departmental activities via electronic and social media;
5. serving as chair of the departmental Technology and Library Committee.

Section. IV. Standing Committees

The standing committees of the department shall consist of the (1) Executive Committee, (2) Graduate Committee, (3) Undergraduate Committee, (4) Technology and Library Committee, (5) Merit Committee, the (6) Nominations Committee, (7) Mentoring Committee and the (8) Scheduling Committee.

Members of all standing committees except the Executive Committee, the Merit Committee, and the Nominations Committee shall be appointed by the department Chair and approved by the Executive Committee. The department Chair shall serve as chair of the Executive Committee, and he/she shall also serve as an *ex officio* (but non-voting) member of all standing committees.

Graduate, Undergraduate, and Library/Technology committee meetings shall be open to all members of the department. Graduate, Undergraduate, and Library/Technology committee action shall be subject to approval by the department. No persons (except *ex officio* members) shall serve on more than one standing committee.

Members of the Graduate, Undergraduate, Library/Technology, and Mentoring committees will be appointed in August; their terms shall commence in August and run for one calendar year.

The Executive Committee shall consist of six members in addition to the department Chair who shall serve as its chair. At the end of the spring semester of each year the members of the department shall elect the members of the Executive Committee who will serve in the following academic year. To cast a valid ballot, each member of the department shall vote for as many as six persons, only three of whom can represent the same field of history (e.g., U.S. history, European history, Latin American history). The six persons receiving the highest number of votes shall be elected, with the two receiving the most votes serving two-year terms. In case of

ties, a run-off election will be held. In case of resignations or unexpired term, the person receiving the next highest vote shall fill out the unexpired term, providing that not more than three elected members of the committee shall be from the same field of history. Incumbent members of the Executive Committee shall not be eligible for reelection.

The Executive Committee shall:

1. confirm all appointments to other committees, including search committees, made by the department chair;
2. make recommendations for the long-range program of the department;
3. advise the chair on the best use of funds in the department's operating budget;
4. make recommendations to the department concerning basic policy matters which transcend the responsibilities of other standing committees;
5. make recommendations to the faculty on areas of faculty appointments;
6. review periodically the departmental bylaws and make recommendations, if necessary, for their revision.

The Graduate Committee shall consist of the Chair of the department, *ex officio*, the Director of Graduate Studies, who will serve as chair of the committee, the Associate Director of Graduate Studies, and at least four other members of the faculty of the department, with membership reflecting departmental geographical and thematic strengths. When considering curriculum matters the committee is encouraged to meet with one or more graduate students designated by a History student organization or by the Graduate Coordinator. It shall:

1. recommend to the faculty graduate degree program requirements and policies;
2. recommend to the faculty changes in the graduate curriculum;
3. approve the appointment of teaching assistants;
4. approve applications for admission to the MA and Ph.D. programs;
5. review records of graduate students at the end of their third semester of residence, and periodically thereafter, in order to advise inadequate students to drop.

The Undergraduate Committee shall consist of the Chair of the department, *ex officio*, the Director of Undergraduate Studies, who will serve as chair of the committee, and at least four other members of the faculty of the department. When considering curriculum matters, the committee is encouraged to meet with one or more undergraduate students designated by a History student organization or by the Undergraduate Coordinator. It shall:

1. recommend to the department program requirements for undergraduate History majors;
2. recommend to the department changes in the undergraduate curriculum;
3. recommend to the department on any other matters affecting undergraduate instruction and enrollments.

The Technology and Library Committee shall consist of the Technology and Library Director, who will serve as chair, at least two other members of the department, and the department Chair, *ex officio*. It shall:

1. recommend action for the development of technology for teaching and research purposes;

2. recommend action for the development of history library holdings and an equitable distribution of library funds among the fields of history;
3. help maintain the department website and help advertise departmental activities via electronic and social media;
4. consider and make recommendations on any other problems concerning technology issues, relations with the library, or classroom space or usage.

The Merit Committee is annually elected in the fall of each academic year on the same ballot with the Nominations Committee. It is composed of three members, one from each rank. No faculty member shall serve on the Merit Committee more than twice in five years. To provide continuity, the tenured faculty member who receives the highest number of votes will serve for two years.

1. Each member of the Merit Committee reads all the faculty activity reports, supplemented by c.v.'s, teaching evaluations, copies of recent publications, and other materials to assist the merit committee, as described below.
2. The committee then assembles and deliberates carefully before assigning each member of the faculty a rating in keeping with the department's guidelines.
3. The department's approach avoids vesting arbitrary power over raises and other rewards in a single individual.
4. A fourth member of the department, who must be tenured, replaces the assistant professor for the purpose of the annual post-tenure review. This fourth colleague is elected on the same ballot as the Merit Committee. See Appendix III for details.

The Nominations Committee is annually elected in the fall of each academic year on the same ballot with the Merit Committee. It is composed of three members, one from each rank. No faculty member shall serve on the Nominations Committee more than twice in five years. To provide continuity, the tenured faculty member who receives the highest number of votes will serve for two years.

1. Each member of the Nominations Committee will deliberate about who in the department should be nominated for the university and college teaching awards, external teaching awards (such as the Carnegie Endowment for the Advancement of Teaching Professor of the Year), Moores Professorships, the Farfel Award, external research and scholarship awards (such as membership in the American Academy of Arts and Sciences), and the university research awards.
2. Committee members will coordinate with the appropriate faculty members to write the nomination letters, but committee members will be responsible for recruiting the external letters and assembling the nomination files.

The Mentoring Committee is appointed annually in the fall of each academic year. It is composed of up to six members, with no more than two from each rank. No faculty member shall serve on the Mentoring Committee more than twice in five years. To provide continuity, the department chair will appoint the committee chair who will serve for two years.

1. The Mentoring Committee will work primarily with assistant professors on the tenure track to help them with planning for their publication submissions.
2. The Mentoring Committee will also help advise assistant professors on the tenure track about course development and teaching strategies.

3. The Mentoring Committee will provide input to the Chair regarding the progress of tenure track faculty to assist the Chair with her/his mentoring responsibilities for tenure track faculty.
4. The Mentoring Committee will also assist associate and full professors who might want advice about their scholarship or their teaching.

The Scheduling Committee members are selected every two years. Membership on the committee is staggered. It is composed of seven faculty members, two Associate or Full Professors from the American history field, (one for U.S. history survey and one for upper-level and graduate curriculum) one from the European field, one from the Latin American field, one from the Middle Eastern field, one from the Public history field, and one from the Transnational field. The Transnational field is currently composed of faculty who teach in the areas of Africa, and Asia. The faculty from each field will identify and select their representative on the committee.

1. The committee will assist the chair and the schedule coordinator construct the fall and spring class schedules to avoid faculty conflict and competition for students, to ensure that students' programmatic needs and interests are met at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, and to secure the best classrooms available to support and enhance the pedagogy of the faculty.
2. The Chair will make the final decision about the course assignments and schedule based on the input from the Scheduling Committee.
3. The committee will meet at the end of both the fall and spring semesters to craft the class schedules for the next fall and spring semesters. The chair will prepare the schedule for summer sessions. The committee will use the current and previous semester schedules to produce the next ones. The committee will follow the recommendations of the Undergraduate and Graduate Directors and Advisors in identifying which CORE courses are needed as well as those classes that have not been offered the past three years and are therefore in jeopardy of being deleted by the Registrar's Office.
4. Members of the committee will request from the faculty in their respective teaching areas or geographical and thematic fields what they wish to teach, the mode of instruction and the type of classroom required to do so. The committee as a whole will construct the proposed schedule based on faculty requests and departmental needs. The faculty may request their preferred courses, time bands or days and times, but the ultimate proposal to the chair concerning the schedule will be that of the committee.

Section V. Appointments and Promotions

All departmental recommendations on promotions and terminal contracts shall be approved by a meeting of those holding professorial rank senior to that of the faculty member being considered. When called upon by the Dean of the College for departmental recommendations for promotion, the Chair shall call special meetings of the appropriate groups to consider the records of those holding a lower rank. Recommendations on promotion and tenure shall be made according to criteria adopted by the department.

All departmental recommendations for the granting of University tenure shall be made with the approval of the full professors and the associate professors who have been awarded tenure by the University.

Section VI. Amendment

These bylaws may be amended at any meeting of the department during the fall or spring semesters by the vote of a majority of all voting members in residence, providing that five days' notice of the proposed action has been given.

Section VIII. Enabling Clause

These bylaws and the attached appendices shall go into effect upon acceptance by a majority of all members of the department.

Adopted May, 1968

Amended May, 1969

Amended April, 1970

Amended September, 1970

Amended January, 1971

Amended October 1, 1976

Amended January 24, 1977

Revised April, 1977

Revised April, 2005

Amended February 16, 2015

Amended May 8, 2015

Revised July 2021

Appendix I
Department of History
Tenure and Promotion Standards

While it is difficult to provide precise standards, due to the subjective nature of evaluation in teaching, scholarship, and departmental service, the History Department conforms to the following general guidelines:

To Associate Professor with Tenure:

1. Teaching:

A strong teaching performance as indicated by evaluative factors that include:

- Clarity in the organization and presentation of course content
- Fairness in dealing with students. This includes making oneself available for consultation and establishing clear and reasonable standards for measuring student performance
- Initiative and creativity in the design and modification of courses in the curriculum

2. Scholarship:

A strong scholarly performance as indicated by evaluative factors that include:

- A substantial body of published scholarship of high quality, including a book based on original research and published by a major press
- Evidence of continuing scholarly growth

3. Service:

- Substantial departmental, professional and community service

To Professor:

1. Teaching:

A strong teaching performance as indicated by evaluative factors that include:

- Clarity in the organization and presentation of course content
- Fairness in dealing with students. This includes making oneself available for consultation and establishing clear and reasonable standards for measuring student performance
- Initiative and creativity in the design and modification of courses in the curriculum

2. Scholarship:

A strong scholarly performance as indicated by evaluative factors that include:

- A substantial body of published work of high quality, including two books based on original scholarship and published by major presses
- Evidence of continuing scholarly growth

3. Service:

- Extensive departmental, professional and community service.

Appendix II

Annual Reviews and Third Year Review Policy for Tenure Track Faculty

ANNUAL REVIEW: Per the By-Laws of the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences, probationary faculty on the tenure track will be reviewed annually by the department chair. Except for the third year review, described below, these annual reviews will involve a conversation between the tenure-track faculty member and the chair regarding where the faculty member stands with regard to the publication of scholarly works necessary for tenure and promotion, whether the faculty member is developing an appropriate portfolio of courses, and the service record of the faculty member. Such conversations may also include discussion about strategy for seeking external fellowships and grants and otherwise advancing one's standing in the profession. The chair will provide the faculty member with a written memorandum summarizing the conversation.

THIRD YEAR REVIEW: A full pre-tenure review normally occurs in the tenure-track assistant professor's third year. Tenured associate and full professors in the department will conduct a comprehensive review of his or her record of (a) scholarship; (b) teaching; and (c) service to the university, community, and/or profession for the purpose of assessing progress toward tenure. The probationary faculty member will assemble a portfolio of all publications and manuscripts in preparation; syllabi, sample course materials, and teaching evaluations; and evidence of service. This portfolio will be made available to the tenured associate and full professors in the department for review, and the chair will schedule a meeting, typically in the fall semester, during which the faculty member's file will be discussed and evaluated. Following this meeting, the department chair will conduct a review encompassing both faculty and chair assessments and write a letter to the faculty member discussing strengths and weaknesses of the pre-tenure portfolio. This letter will be forwarded to the dean of the college and placed in the candidate's personnel file.

Appendix III

Department of History Guidelines for Promotion in Rank of Instructional Faculty (Instructional Assistant Professor to Instructional Associate Professor and Instructional Associate Professor to Instructional Professor)

This document outlines the expectations and standards that will be used by the Department of History at the University of Houston to evaluate whether candidates meet the criteria for promotion of instructional non-tenure-track faculty (hereafter referred to as “NTT faculty”). Recommendations contained in this document should be considered in conjunction with criteria and standards for promotion stated in the most recent edition of the Faculty Handbook and Promotion Guidelines of the University of Houston which are located on the University of Houston website <http://www.uh.edu/provost/faculty/current/non-tenure-track/>. Special attention should be given to various deadlines that are indicated in the University guidelines as these dates may vary from year to year. Candidates are strongly advised to consult with the department chair and, if applicable, program director before proceeding with the application.

Promotion-eligible Instructional Non-Tenure-Track faculty perform varying tasks within the department and they are hired for various purposes. It is accordingly difficult to define precise guidelines for promotion. It is necessary, however, to set some general standards to assure that faculty under review are judged fairly. These guidelines for professional evaluation of instructional faculty do not prescribe a uniform roster of accomplishments that must be achieved by all candidates for promotion. Rather, they suggest ways of evaluating accomplishments in teaching, service, professional engagement and/or research by allowing flexibility in assigning relative weights to these activities.

It is assumed that 65% of the workload for Instructional Non-Tenured-Track faculty will be teaching, 20% will be substantial service, and 15% will be professional engagement and/or research, unless otherwise specified at the time of appointment. The relative weights may be adjusted at the discretion of the department chair and the executive committee.

Criteria for promotion to Associate Instructional Professor

Candidates should have sustained, significant contributions in teaching, service, and professional engagement and/or research such as fulfill department requirements.

Criteria for Promotion to Full Instructional Professor

A candidate for full instructional professor should have significant contributions to the department in two of the three domains of teaching, service, or professional engagement and/or research. Preference would be also for the candidate to have contributed recognizably beyond the university.



BREAKDOWN OF TEACHING, SERVICE, AND RESEARCH CRITERIA

Teaching

Unless otherwise stated at the time of appointment, an Instructional Non-Tenured-Track faculty in the Department of History is primarily hired to teach full-time. To merit the strongest consideration, candidates must have demonstrated superior teaching skills. Areas of important interest in this category include, but are not limited to,

- Clarity in the organization and presentation of course content as stated in syllabi and during classroom lectures and discussions.
- Demonstrating knowledge of the field taught in line with recent scholarship.
- Success in bringing students to a level of attainment appropriate for the courses taught by the candidate.
- Equitableness and effectiveness in dealing with students. This includes making oneself available for regular office hours face to face, by email and blackboard as well as establishing clear and reasonable measures for gauging student progress.

Candidates are also expected to contribute to the department's continuing improvement of teaching methods, techniques, and materials. Here are some examples of ways to contribute (it will be assumed that each individual will contribute to several of these activities)

- Initiative and creativity in the design and modification of courses in the curriculum.
- Technology and pedagogical innovation that enhance course delivery and student engagement.
- Consideration and possible adoption of new textbooks (as needed).
- Design or modification of curricular or pedagogical resources for students.
- Peer classroom observation (observing and being observed).
- Development of and participation in co-curricular activities that enrich the classroom experience.
- Mentorship of undergraduate and/or graduate research.
- Coordination of exams or assessments.
- Study abroad faculty or coordinator of a learning abroad program

Evaluation of the candidate's skills in the area of teaching will be based on the following:

- Classroom observations by peers.
- Assessment of student evaluations.
- Grade distributions.
- Evaluation of sample syllabi, assignments, lesson plans, grading rubrics, etc.
- Nomination for, or conferral of, teaching awards.
- Submission/conferral of teaching-related grants.

- For promotion to Full Instructional Professor, the candidate must demonstrate influence outside the department, college, and university, and this will be evaluated in accordance with the guidelines articulated in the Provost's NTT Faculty Policy.

Service

The service component will vary according to position; candidates will coordinate major service assignments with the chairperson and program director (if applicable). What the voting faculty will look for in this category is a willingness on the part of the candidate to participate constructively in the operation of the Department, the candidate's program (if applicable), and possibly of the university or the profession. Examples of service include but are not limited to:

- Committee service (department, college, or university).
- Course/program director or coordination.
- Contribution to departmental affairs such as planning, coordinating schedules, and TA training and allocation.
- Contribution (if applicable) to administrative support in areas such as organizing research seminars, conferences, and events.
- Participation in community organizations related to department or program mission.
- Student academic, professional, and degree plan advising.
- Coordination of cultural events (department, college, university).
- Co-curricular events and opportunities.
- Study abroad planning, marketing, coordination, and/or implementation.
- Fundraising.
- Development of instructional/training materials for the department.
- Mentorship of undergraduate and/or graduate research.
- Teaching-related community outreach: lectures, exhibitions, editing of publications
- Coordination of exams or assessments.

Professional Engagement and/or Research

Unless otherwise specified at the time of appointment, Instructional Non-Tenured-Track faculty are not primarily hired to conduct research, and the professional engagement and/or research standards expected of them accordingly differ from those required of tenure-track faculty. However, in order to ensure the highest level of teaching and service, the department expects NTT faculty to be exposed to recent trends and scholarship in their fields, either through professional engagement or research. Examples of professional engagement and/or research include:

- Presenting at academic conferences, workshops, or colloquia.
- Attendance of academic conferences, workshops, or colloquia.
- Publication of peer-reviewed academic articles, scholarly chapters, digital humanities projects, edited volumes, or books.

- Submission/Publication of book reviews, encyclopedia entries, and pedagogical resources.
- Presentation/attendance at professional development workshops/webinars.
- Pedagogical innovation at the level of the profession.
- Membership in professional organizations or learned societies in the field.
- Receipt of research grants, awards, or fellowships in the field.
- Evidence of primary research such as consulting archives, conducting oral history interviews, or engagement with primary texts etc.
- Professional service activities (e.g. committees, leadership positions).

Appendix IV
Department of History, University of Houston
Merit Guidelines

Purpose: The History Department has an on-going commitment to the objective, careful, and thorough assessment it undertakes annually as part of the merit system. Department faculty members annually elect a committee of three faculty members, one from each rank, with rules ensuring a fair rotation in the assignment of this critical responsibility. No faculty member shall serve on the Merit Committee more than twice in five years. To provide continuity, the tenured faculty member who receives the highest number of votes will serve for two years.* Each member of the democratically elected and representative Merit Committee reads all the faculty activity reports, supplemented by c.v.'s, teaching evaluations, copies of recent publications, and other materials to assist the merit committee, as described below. The committee then assembles and deliberates carefully before assigning each member of the faculty an overall merit rating in keeping with the department's guidelines. The department's approach avoids the appearance and reality of vesting arbitrary power over raises and other rewards in a single individual.

*Note: A fourth member of the department, who must be tenured, replaces the assistant professor for the purpose of the annual post-tenure review. This fourth colleague is elected on the same ballot as the Merit Committee.

Procedures: The History Department considers the Merit Committee's overall merit rating a strong recommendation to the Chair, more than merely advisory. After deliberating as described below, the Merit Committee will submit its overall merit ratings directly to individual faculty members, along with a deadline for written appeals to the Merit Committee, and will notify the department by email that evaluations have been distributed. Any faculty member not satisfied with his/her overall merit rating must submit a written appeal and also may request a meeting with the Merit Committee. After further deliberation in response to appeals, the Merit Committee will make its final recommendations and send its merit reports for all faculty to the Chair.

In cases where the Chair disagrees with the Merit Committee's overall merit ratings, the Chair will meet with the Merit Committee to attempt to come to agreement. In cases of continued disagreement, the Executive Committee (of which the Chair is a member) will determine the final overall merit rating for the faculty member in question.

Evaluation of Merit Committee and Department Chair: The Chair will select a subcommittee of three members of the standing Executive Committee (one from each rank) to undertake the evaluation of members of the Merit Committee. The Chair and the subcommittee will make every effort to ensure thorough and consistent evaluation of Merit Committee members.

The Merit Committee will evaluate the Department Chair as a member of the faculty, modifying the departmental guidelines to allow due consideration for the emphasis Chairs must place on their administrative duties.

Operation of the Merit Committee: Each committee will be chaired by the most senior member of the committee. The committee chair will provide each member with the current merit guidelines (which include a standard evaluation form as Addendum 1), the prior year's merit reports, annual reports by preceding merit committees (see below), a summary of teaching evaluation data for all faculty, and departmental salary information for consideration in equity requests. Every member of the committee shall review the merit files of every member of the department, using the standard evaluation form to highlight the important aspects of research, teaching, and service.

The committee will meet to discuss the Faculty Activity Reports and will arrive at an overall merit rating for each person. Each member of the faculty will be provided with a written evaluation summarizing the committee's findings and its final overall merit rating. The chair of the committee will divide up the responsibility of writing the evaluations among committee members. Prior to distribution, committee members will submit the written evaluations to the committee chair who will review them for stylistic consistency before submitting them to the individual faculty members.

At the end of the process, the Merit Committee will write a report summarizing the committee's work, explaining any difficult decisions, and noting any concerns or other information that might be useful for subsequent Merit Committees. These reports will be kept on file and passed along each year to incoming Merit Committees. The purpose is to improve consistency and also to identify issues that may require adjustment of the merit guidelines.

Faculty members shall be responsible for providing the Merit Committee with copies of any publications, a Statement on Research to supplement the Faculty Activity Reporting Form (see Addendum 2 below), and any supporting materials that may assist the committee in its deliberations. Any member of the faculty failing to submit a faculty activity form after the department has made a reasonable effort to solicit the form shall be assigned an overall merit rating of 1.

Merit Category Guidelines: Overall Merit Rating (5 point scale)*

The department recognizes and rewards faculty excellence in research, teaching, and service through the overall merit rating. Because the University of Houston is a research university, and because of the high priority the department places on research, the overall merit rating (5 point scale) shall be equal to the research rating (5 point scale). However, in cases of exemplary teaching or service, the overall merit rating may be raised above the research rating; likewise, in cases of derelict teaching or service, the overall merit rating may be lowered below the research rating. The following serve as guidelines for raising or lowering the overall merit rating relative to the research rating:

+1 A faculty member's overall merit rating shall be increased to 1 level above the research rating in cases where the faculty member earns a teaching rating of "exceeds expectations" two years in a row or earns a service rating of "exceeds expectations" two years in a row. The maximum possible rating is a 5 (if a faculty member earning this boost already had a research

rating of 5, the rating would remain the same). Faculty members with a research rating of 3+ earning this boost would be rated a 4.

-1 A faculty member's overall merit rating shall be decreased to 1 level below the research rating in cases where the faculty member earns a teaching rating of "fails to meet expectations" two years in a row or earns a service rating of "fails to meet expectations" for that merit year. The lowest possible rating is a 1 (if a faculty member earning this reduction already had a research rating of 1, the rating would remain the same). Faculty members with a research rating of 3+ earning for this reduction would be rated a 2.

Merit Category Guidelines: Research (5 point scale)*

5 Rating in this category is based on the publication of a book-length manuscript of original scholarship, or a major professional award for a book. Manuscripts "in press" (meaning verifiably in production, not simply under contract) also qualify for this category. As such, a book ultimately receives two ratings of 5 for research: the first in the year the book goes into production and the second in the year the book is published (should the book go into production and be published in the same calendar year then the faculty member will receive a 5 for two years in a row). A third 5 may be awarded for books that receive a major award. More than one achievement that each rates a 4 may also qualify for a 5.

4 Rating in this category is based on the publication of a refereed article, a book chapter of original scholarship, a peer-reviewed textbook published by a recognized academic or commercial press, lead editorship of an edited volume, a major grant, fellowship, or contract beneficial to the faculty member's individual research and/or the graduate program, a regional professional award, an article award, or a university research or teaching award.**

3+ Rating in this category is based on documentation of outstanding research activity, such as having the manuscript of a monograph that has been sent by the press to outside readers, extensive archival research trips, multiple conference presentations, invited talks, or a combination of such activities. A 3+ also may recognize scholarly products other than those recognized by a "4" or "5" rating.**

3 Rating in this category is based on documentation of on-going research activity, including progress on a book, article(s), book chapter(s), and/or completion of encyclopedia entries and book reviews.

2 Rating in this category is based on negligible evidence of research-related professional activity.

1 Rating in this category presumes no progress in research.

*Note: The description of each research rating category is meant to guide the deliberations of the Merit Committee and the department chair in determining the research rating for each faculty member. However, the guidelines do not constitute absolute or rigid standards without

qualification. To provide consistency over time, qualifications or other criteria devised by a Merit Committee in response to particular circumstances should be set out in the written report for the next year's Committee.

**Note: The following scholarly products may be considered for a 3+ or 4: revised editions of monographs, foreign language translations of previously published work, anthologies of previously published articles, and co-authored articles. In each case the faculty member is responsible for providing materials to assist the Merit Committee in evaluating the significance of the work in question.

***Note: For digital humanities projects and public history projects see Addendum 4.

Merit Category Guidelines: Teaching and Service (3 category scales)

The History Department will rate teaching and service according to the following categories:

- A) Exceeds Expectations
- B) Meets Expectations
- C) Fails to Meet Expectations

In both Teaching and Service, expectations increase with academic rank.

TEACHING

- A. A faculty member might be considered to have exceeded expectations if he or she:
 - 1. Receives a college, university, or other significant teaching award, or
 - 2. In any given year provides *extensive meritorious* service to the department's teaching mission by way of new course/curriculum development, notable service teaching (e.g., teaching more than one large section), or exceptional advising and/or service on examination/thesis/dissertation committees.
- B. To meet the department's expectations in teaching, a faculty member must demonstrate continuing dedication to the teaching mission of the department by fulfilling such responsibilities as:
 - 1. Holding regular office hours and teaching his/her assigned courses with evaluations that are at or near departmental means;
 - 2. Periodic course development, curriculum development, service teaching, advising, and service on examination/thesis/dissertation committees.
- C. This category includes any faculty member who fails to hold regular offices hours, regularly misses scheduled classes, or whose course evaluations are deemed below average by the Merit Committee.

SERVICE

- A. To exceed expectations in service, faculty must perform well above average in any given year providing documented extensive meritorious service well beyond the standard expectations outlined in B below. This might include:

1. Departmental service as Director of Graduate Studies, Director of Undergraduate Studies, or Director of Technology and Library Services
2. Departmental service on more than one committee (includes standing committees and search committees, but not ad hoc committees).
3. Extensive college or university service in addition to normal departmental service
4. Extensive service to the profession or to the community in addition to normal departmental service

B. To meet the department's expectations in service, a faculty member not on leave or holding an administrative position in the college/university must demonstrate continuing commitment to the service mission of the department, college, and university through attendance of departmental meetings and active involvement in the work of one assigned departmental standing committee as well as any college or university committees. Service at the college and university levels as well as service to the profession and to the community do not replace departmental service in at least one assigned standing committee.

C. This category includes any faculty member who fails to meet the expectations listed under B above. Service on standing committees is mandatory for those duly elected (Executive, Merit, Nominations) or for those appointed by the chairperson and approved by the Executive Committee (Graduate, Undergraduate, Technology and Library, Mentoring, and search committees). A faculty member who refuses to serve or who fails to attend meetings of a standing committee for reasons other than illness (reported to payroll), medical or personal emergency granted by the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences, or faculty development leave, shall receive "fails to meet expectations" on their service merit rating.

Addendum One: Form for the Use of Merit Committee

NAME:

OVERALL MERIT RATING

5 4 3+ 3 2 1

Rationale for raising or lowering relative to research rating:

RESEARCH:

Publications:

Work in progress (compare with previous year's Faculty Activity Report and Statement of Research):

Conferences/Lectures:

Other:

5 4 3+ 3 2 1

TEACHING:

Courses:

Evaluations:

Graduate Committees:

Other:

Exceeds, meets, or fails to meet expectations

SERVICE:

UH Committees (identify level):

Professional:

Community:

Other:

Exceeds, meets, or fails to meet expectations

NOTES AND/OR QUESTIONS:

Addendum Two:

Statement on Research for use of the Merit Committee (to be distributed to the faculty along with the College's Faculty Activity Report Form)

Please provide a narrative outlining your current research project(s) and the work accomplished during the calendar year under consideration. You may include information about trips to archives, grants applied for or received in support of research, presentations of research, the status of drafts of chapters and articles, contact with journal and book publishers, or explanations of the significance of particular journals or outside recognitions.

Faculty members must supply materials supporting this research narrative to the Merit Committee (as always, they must provide copies of any publications). Particularly in the case of non-traditional scholarly formats, please provide documentation (by outside evaluators if possible) of the significance of the contributions to the advancement or transformation of historical knowledge.

Addendum Three:
Guidelines for Distribution of the Raise Pool

The Executive Committee believes that the system for distributing merit money as voted on by the faculty on November 12, 2003 is basically sound but that some additional guidelines are needed, particularly in the areas of book and inequity monies.

The committee recommends that book money be given at the time of publication. Article awards can earn a second 4 but not book money, or a 5.

The committee also recommends that the department award inequity money in those years when the raise pool is 3% or higher. In years where the raise pool is less than 3%, all money would go towards merit and book money.

Annual raise notifications (typically distributed by the Chair during the summer) shall be accompanied by a statement of the total raise pool and the dollar amounts for each overall merit rating category, and equity raises should be identified separately as such.

To regularize department practice for dealing with years when there is not a raise pool to reward high performing faculty, the Merit Committee will adhere to the following guidelines:

Book Money: faculty who publish a book during a year when there was not a merit pool will be awarded book money by the subsequent year's Merit Committee.

4s and 5s for Research: if the previous year lacked a merit pool, the Merit Committee will provide two ratings in the merit reports. The committee will calculate a merit score for the current calendar year in question and an "overall merit rating" that carries the higher of the two ratings forward into the present year. For example, let us say that last year Professor X was awarded a 4 for a peer reviewed article in a year without a raise pool and a 3 for ongoing work during the current year. Professor X would be rated a 3 for the current year, but a 4 for "overall merit rating." In cases where faculty are awarded 5s for books either "in press" or "in print" the Merit Committee should make every effort to guarantee that a 5 is awarded for each of the two stages in the publishing process recognized in the merit guidelines.

These guidelines only deal with a one-year lapse in merit monies. In the unfortunate case of multiple years without merit pools, the Merit Committee should propose a solution that eventually distributes the next available merit pool equitably.

Addendum Four

Merit Guidelines for Digital Humanities

Recognizing that new forms of conducting and presenting historical scholarship need to be evaluated rigorously and fairly, the department employs procedures that reflect recent discipline-wide discussions on “best practices” for assessing Digital Humanities (DH), which often turn on collaboration with teams both within and outside of our university. DH Scholars produce work that is both traditional (e.g., articles and books) and digital. As such, the following addendum **does not replace or contradict other merit guidelines** (e.g., an article is still rated a 4; multiple conference presentations are still rated a 3+), but rather outlines a procedure for evaluating projects that use computational tools, methods, and digital presentation to make a substantive intellectual intervention into a historical debate. These guidelines are specifically intended to help faculty evaluate digital scholarship, which may appear in less familiar, non-print and non-traditional forms.¹

A DH project represents an intellectual agenda as well as a specific deliverable (such as a digital supplement to a book, website, corpus of sources, academic blog, etc.). DH projects can take many forms, both those recognizably equivalent to print documents and those that take a non-linear or non-prose form. Publication and peer-review may go through traditional processes and forms, but may also appear in open-access journals and online collectives. DH projects may provide a new lens to a long debated problem or use tools and methods to address scholarly questions not approachable with other methodologies. DH projects can also take a tremendous amount of time in building datasets, cleaning data, applying different programs, and developing final products. DH projects also present unprecedented new opportunities for communicating research to both professional and lay audiences, thus significantly increasing the outreach of knowledge produced at universities.

Despite this broad definition, hosting a project, exhibition, or research online does not necessarily make it a DH project, nor is the use of a digital tool/computer program always considered DH (e.g., a project may be better evaluated as a public history project). Likewise, publishing a traditional article or book in a digitized fashion or through a digital medium does not make a project a DH project.² Finally, always searching for an “equivalency” between a DH project and a traditional print product can be problematic as it is “predicated on comparing fundamentally different knowledge artifacts and...consider print publications as the norm and benchmark from which to measure all other work.”³

¹ "Guidelines for the Professional Evaluation of Digital Scholarship by Historians," AHA [<https://www.historians.org/teaching-and-learning/digital-history-resources/evaluation-of-digital-scholarship-in-history/guidelines-for-the-professional-evaluation-of-digital-scholarship-by-historians>].

² “Promotion and Tenure for Digital Scholarship: An Open Letter to the to the Promotion and Tenure Committee at Texas A&M University, Department of English, upon their request for information about how to evaluate digital work for promotion and tenure” [<http://idhmcmain.tamu.edu/commentpress/promotion-and-tenure/>]

³ “Evaluating Digital Scholarship”, Todd Presner, UCLA Digital Humanities Program [http://humanitiesblast.com/Evaluating_digital_scholarship.pdf].

Instead, at its highest form, a DH project will demonstrate:

- Rigorous contribution to the discipline/multiple disciplines: This includes creation of new knowledge; empirical density; scholarly engagement; new examination of historical sources; and both quality and quantity/scale of output. Additionally, “It is important for review committees to recognize that new knowledge is not just new content but also new ways of organizing, classifying, and interacting with content.”⁴
- Digital Engagement: This includes innovative and/or sophisticated and highly professional digital presentation. Although historians are not necessarily trained in computational skills or as digital specialists, an understanding of and engagement with the digital structure and choices made within a project are integral to DH philosophy and methodology.
- Collaboration: Because the work of a digital project often includes multiple skills not inherent to one individual, a core tenet of DH is scholarly collaboration and teamwork.
- Community Engagement: A core value of DH is the invitation of a wider academic and public community into a project in its creation and/or final dissemination and presentation. This can include conferences and invited talks; release of data and material; use of social networks for broader outreach; and print and/or digital publications resulting from the application of the DH project.
- Record of Peer-Review: Peer-review may occur at different stages of the project, but in its end form, a project should be reviewed external to the project and the hosting university or universities.⁵ Evidence of peer-review may come from a traditional publishing board through substantive journal publication or professional external review, but may also include a record of grant funding for the project (internal and/or external) or the reception of a prestigious award.

According to the American Historical Association’s Statement on Standards of Professional Conduct, scholarship is “a process, not a product.” Much like traditional historical research, which may yield multiple outcomes (e.g., book chapter; conference presentation; edited volume; synthetic book; grant), so too does a DH project achieve different phases of completion through its lifetime (e.g., development and release of a data set; 3D reconstruction; live web app). Each stage may involve the creation of new content (e.g., significant addition of sources), knowledge (e.g., development of new analytical tools), or outreach tools (e.g., presence in social networks).

Given the limited nature of our raise pools and the incredible diversity of potential DH projects, it is incumbent on the Merit Committee to maintain a high-bar for evaluating such faculty work while also respecting the conventions of each field. That bar should be no higher or no lower than for other forms of scholarship. When a faculty member submits a digital project as part of a larger body of work for the year, the Merit Committee will consider DH projects for 3+, 4, or 5

⁴ “Evaluating Digital Scholarship”, Todd Presner, UCLA Digital Humanities Program
[http://humanitiesblast.com/Evaluating_digital_scholarship.pdf]

⁵ “Promotion and Tenure for Digital Scholarship: An Open Letter to the to the Promotion and Tenure Committee at Texas A&M University, Department of English, upon their request for information about how to evaluate digital work for promotion and tenure”
[<http://idhmcmain.tamu.edu/commentpress/promotion-and-tenure/>]

rating (see the list below). It is the responsibility of the faculty involved in a given project to provide evidence of the scholarly merit of the DH project in question. Given the ongoing nature of a DH project and the multiple milestones it may achieve, a project may be eligible for a 3+ and 4 multiple times, but a 5 is reserved for its completion. To aid the Merit Committee in evaluating each project, the faculty member should submit an addendum (1,000 maximum words) addressing the following questions in regards to the scholarly outcome and contribution to historical knowledge:⁶

- How the DH project is a coherent project;
- How the DH project as a whole contributes to the larger intellectual agenda pursued by the faculty member;
- What local arguments are made by the submitted DH project phase/stage;
- What methods does the scholar use to achieve the goals of the submitted phase/stage;
- How the DH project phase/stage completed is distinct and sufficient unto itself, especially if it has already been awarded a 3+ or 4 previously;
- How the DH project contributes to the next phase of the faculty member's intellectual agenda;
- To what larger or stronger claims the DH project phase/stage will eventually contribute.

Once a faculty member submits this addendum, it is the responsibility of the Merit Committee to evaluate the digital work "in the medium in which it was produced and published."⁷ In other words, if a project is hosted online, the merit committee must consider the project in its online environment.⁸

The following list is to be used as a helpful guideline and to offer assistance in reviewing the many, different iterations of Digital Humanities:

Rating 3+:

- Faculty member is a collaborator or a principal investigator;
- Documentation of ongoing research work with a DH project, which might include the following:
 - Adding a significant amount of new data to already existing data set or digital collection;

⁶ Compare with: Evaluation Criteria for the Scholarship of Engagement, used by the National Review Board, modified March 2002 [<http://www.unh.edu/engaged-scholars/pdf/review-board-criteria.pdf>]

⁷ "Evaluating Digital Scholarship," Todd Presner, UCLA Digital Humanities Program [http://humanitiesblast.com/Evaluating_digital_scholarship.pdf].

⁸ "Guidelines for the Professional Evaluation of Digital Scholarship by Historians," AHA [<https://www.historians.org/teaching-and-learning/digital-history-resources/evaluation-of-digital-scholarship-in-history/guidelines-for-the-professional-evaluation-of-digital-scholarship-by-historians>].

- Adding additional features to already functioning information systems (e.g., full text search for digital collections; new models in a geographic information system);
- Active engagement with professional and lay audiences through regular updates of the project's website, pages in social media, or a mailing list.
- Work with a fairly limited data set that is based on a single source or a few sources;
- A standalone resource that improves our knowledge of the subject, but does not involve large-scale data processing;
- Such work may include, but is not limited to:
 - A large, regularly updated analytical blog post on a topic of scholarly interest;
 - Curating a page/pages in social media that offer a substantial engagement with the audience;
 - Application of a computer program or web app to a historical problem. The result can be in form of a completed and publicly available interactive timeline, network visualization, or a digital map of a certain period/region.

Rating 4:

- Faculty member is a principal investigator/director or co-director;
- Evidence of peer review external to the project and project's university (either through professional external review and/or substantive journal publication about the project);
- Evidence of internal or external funding;
- Work with a complex data set that is mined from multiple sources or archives;
- Incorporation of analytical tools (visualization, text classification, retrieval of data from database through flexible parameters, etc.);
- Such work may include, but is not limited to:
 - Release of a substantial, curated dataset;
 - Digital archive, exhibit or collection;
 - 3D Digital Reconstruction;
 - A live web app with interface; collaborative project; online archive;
 - An extensive, collaborative series of posts/articles from prominent scholars of the field intended for a wide audience.

Rating 5:

- Faculty member is a principal investigator/director or co-director;
- Work with a complex data set that is mined from multiple sources or archives;
- Long-range and large-scale project;
- Record of Peer review external to the project and project's university (through professional external review, substantive journal publication about the project, and/or the receipt of a prestigious award; onus is on the individual researcher to outline the record of peer review). This may include a record of grant funding for the project (internal and/or external);
- Strong evidence of scholarly collaboration and teamwork;
- Strong evidence of innovative and/or sophisticated and highly professional digital presentation, which may also include the creation of a tool or platform widely applicable within historical research;

- Record of Academic and/or public engagement and presentation (e.g., conferences, invited talks); release of data and material; print and/or digital publications resulting from the application of the DH project.

Examples for each Merit Level (gathered as of Spring 2018)

In order to aid faculty new to DH in understanding both the diversity and complexity of digital projects, the following examples are offered as exemplars for each merit rating. These examples are offered as an aid, but this list is in no way intended to limit or prejudice the committee to evaluate projects only according their model.

Rating 3+:

- Stanford University's Spatial History Project list provides multiple examples of ongoing work.
- A large, regularly updated analytical blog post on a topic of scholarly interest (e.g., Christian Thorne (Williams College: <http://sites.williams.edu/cthorne/>);
- Curating a page/pages in social media that offer a substantial engagement with the audience, e.g. Victorian History on Facebook (<https://www.facebook.com/VictorianEraHistory>), Soviet Art on Facebook (<https://www.facebook.com/artussr/>), Tweets of Old on Twitter (<https://twitter.com/TweetsofOld>), etc.
- Application of a computer program or web app to a historical problem. The result can be in form of a completed and publicly available interactive timeline, network visualization, or a digital map of a certain period/region. Examples: Moscow-based editors of Soviet literary journals (<http://www.soviet-journals.org/networks>); Dynamic map of the Finnish Civil War of 1918 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gnmGW-sIkmg>), The Fight for Democracy in the Middle East timeline (<https://www.tiki-toki.com/timeline/entry/55/The-Fight-for-Democracy-in-the-Middle-East/>).
- Another example is the current maintenance of the Russian History blog (<http://russianhistoryblog.org/>). After it was launched in 2011 (which counts as 4 Merit Rating – see the explanation below), its authors regularly updated it with new material, solicited guest posts, organized round table discussions, and in doing so maintained it as an active and vibrant online for historians of Russia.

Rating 4:

- Release of a substantial, curated dataset, e.g. The Feeding America: The Historic American Cookbook Dataset (Michigan State University: <https://lib.msu.edu/feedingamericadata/>),
- Digital archive, exhibit or collection, e.g. The History Harvest (University of Nebraska: <http://historyharvest.unl.edu>);
- 3D Digital Reconstruction, e.g., The Digital Reconstruction of the Northwest Palace, Nimrud, Assyria (The Metropolitan Museum of Art, et al.: <https://www.metmuseum.org/metmedia/video/collections/ancient-near-eastern-art/northwest-palace-nimrud>);
- A live web app with interface; collaborative project; online archive, e.g. Coin Hoards of the Roman Empire (University of Oxford: <http://chre.ashmus.ox.ac.uk>);

- Mapping the Gulag: Russia's prison system from the 1930s to the present (University of Oxford, et al.: <http://www.gulagmaps.org/maps/map.php?series=1&map=3940>);
- An extensive, collaborative series of posts from prominent scholars of the field intended for a wide audience, e.g., Russian History Blog in 2011, the year it was launched (George Mason University, et al.: <http://russianhistoryblog.org/> - Although not peer-reviewed, this project was labor-intensive with an extensive media campaign and community outreach).

Rating 5:

- ORBIS: The Stanford Geospatial Network Model of the Roman World (Stanford University: <http://orbis.stanford.edu>). A live web app; multiple journal papers both authored and evidence of peer review; applications of the software; strong collaboration with multiple team members; strong media attention; multiple tutorials.
- Railroads and the Making of Modern America (University of Nebraska: <http://railroads.unl.edu>). Multiple digitized archives; searchable web app; visualizations and applications of data; multiple publications both about the project and in using the data.
- The Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade database: www.slavevoyages.org/. Supported by NEH, based at the Emory University, includes information on 36,000 slave voyages, and provides different tools to analyze, visualize, and interpret its data.
- Omeka (George Mason University: <https://rrchnm.org/omekaplatform/>). A group of historians/scholars created a “next-generation web publishing platform for museums, historical societies, scholars, enthusiasts, and educators.” This publishing platform is now widely used throughout the academic world to curate a wide range of exhibits. Although use of Omeka does not constitute a 5 Merit Rating, the creation of a similarly important tool to historical research can be awarded this rating.
- Civil War Washington (University of Nebraska: <http://civilwardc.org>). NEH funded project; not only essays/conferences, but also digitized database, interactive maps, digitized print and photographs
- Viral Texts (Northeastern University: viraltexts.org). A vast and innovative DH project representing a substantial set of innovations over current scholarly praxis.
- Homeric Multitext Project (University of Houston: <http://www.homermultitext.org>). A large, multi-institutional project that brings together the entire, complex transmission history of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* into a single, interactive digital setting with original manuscripts/papyri, scholia, and scholarship.
- The InPhO Project – the Indiana Philosophy Ontology project (University of Indiana - <https://inpho.cogs.indiana.edu>). A collaborative, multi-faceted digital project, which uses a combination of automated methods and expert feedback to create a dynamic computational ontology for the discipline of philosophy. The web platform includes "a variety of tools for students, researchers, programmers and scholar to analyze over 37 million words of philosophical content. The NEH funded project has also generated numerous papers published in venues with less than a 15% acceptance rate and maintains a data blog.

Addendum Five
Post-Tenure Review

Any faculty member who meets expectations in teaching and receives a rating of three or higher in overall performance is automatically considered to have passed the post-tenure review process.

Adopted Nov. 12, 2004
Amended Feb. 16, 2011
Amended Feb. 24, 2012
Amended Apr. 26, 2013
Amended Feb. 16, 2015
Amended May 8, 2015

Addendum Six

Guidelines for the annual performance review of non-tenured track faculty in History Merit Category Guidelines (4 point scale)

5 = Outstanding: to be assessed on a case-by-case basis. Rating in this category is based upon whether the instructional professor exceeds contract obligations including significant service, curriculum development, refereed publications such as a journal article or book chapter, and participation in other professional activities (conference paper presentations or summer seminars) that benefit the department. Receiving a college or university teaching award will also garner the NTT faculty this score. (In cases where a NTT faculty produces significant research/publication of a monograph in a given year, they will be evaluated by the same criteria as TT faculty and awarded as such.)

4 = Good: Based upon contractual obligations, the rating in this category is based upon above average documented teaching performance plus curriculum development and/or significant departmental service.

3 = Satisfactory: Based upon contractual obligations, the rating in this category is based upon documented good teaching performance.

2 = Unsatisfactory: Based upon contractual obligations, the rating in this category is based upon documented poor teaching performance.

Addendum Seven

Guidelines for the Annual Review of Adjunct Instructors and Teaching Fellows

The primary role and responsibility of the department's Adjuncts and graduate Teaching Fellows is to teach. The Chair will collect the performance data associated with the contractual obligations of these instructors of record from the Course Reports. To assess their teaching effectiveness, the Chair will examine sections 1-5 of the reports, especially the data under Section Statistics, Department Statistics and College Statistics as well as the mean scores under each section to determine the instructor's success and effectiveness. The mean scores ranging from 4.0-4.5, along with other criteria, will be used to recommend the reappointment of Adjuncts and Teaching Fellows.

Addendum Eight

Merit Guidelines for Public History

Recognizing that new forms of conducting and presenting historical scholarship need to be evaluated rigorously and fairly, the department employs procedures that reflect recent discipline-wide discussions on “best practices” for assessing Public History (PH) scholarship, which often turns on collaboration with teams both within and outside of our university.

Grants: Grant writing for public history has become increasingly important to historians and history departments that face steep funding challenges and should be rewarded. Writing successful large external grants (defined here as \$25,000 or more for single PI grants and \$50,000 or more for collaborative grants) is an extremely time consuming prospect given the highly and increasingly competitive nature of grants.

PH Projects: The Merit Committee will consider PH projects for 3+, 4, or 5 rating. A 5 represents a major PH project and should demonstrate a combination of most of the following:

- Peer review print and/or digital publications resulting from the PH project.
- Peer review of PH projects.
- An excellent record of grant funding for the project.
- The establishment of important collaboration with other PH projects or groups at other institutions or within this institution.
- Technical innovation and/or sophisticated and highly professional presentation.
- Use of PH tools and methods to address scholarly questions not approachable with other methodologies.
- Long-term viability as a PH resource.

PH projects that embody some of the aspects listed above can be awarded a 3+ or 4 at the discretion of the Merit Committee. It is the responsibility of the faculty involved in a given project to provide evidence of the scholarly merit of the PH project in question. Given that many PH projects are ongoing, the faculty involved can only present a project for Merit Review once, unless a compelling case is made that subsequent revisions and, especially, additions are sufficient for additional merit consideration. Given the limited nature of our raise pools and the incredible diversity of potential PH projects, it is incumbent on the Merit Committee to maintain a high-bar for evaluating such faculty work while also respecting the conventions of each field. That bar should be no higher or no lower than for other forms of scholarship.

Appendix V

Search Priorities, Search Committees, and Faculty Hiring

Priorities. Acting upon recommendations forwarded by the Executive Committee, the Department shall set its hiring priorities by vote in a Department meeting. The Chair shall negotiate these priorities, as necessary, with the College and the University. In cases involving opportunity or spousal hires, the Executive Committee shall conduct an initial review of the individual's credentials and vote on whether or not to proceed further. If the Executive Committee votes to proceed, a Review Committee will be appointed by the Chair and the potential hire will be invited for an on-campus interview, to be conducted in the same manner as in the case of national searches. The Review Committee will be composed of not fewer than three voting members of the Department, one of whom will serve as chair. The Review Committee will present its recommendation at a meeting of the Department. The subsequent vote will determine the Chair's recommendation to the Dean. In cases of an opportunity hire as a second hire from the short list of a national search, the Chair shall solicit a recommendation from the search committee. If the search committee recommends moving forward with the hire, the department will vote on making an offer, pending the Dean's and Provost's approval.

Search Committees. Tenured and tenure-track faculty are eligible to serve on search committees. The Chair shall appoint the members and chairs of search committees, taking into account rank and field. Ordinarily, the chair of a search committee should be a full professor and/or a person whose own research expertise provides insight into the specialization sought. One member of the search committee serves as the Affirmative Action representative.

Procedures. After reviewing all complete applications, the search committee shall make available to the Department the curriculum vitae and publications of the candidates it proposes to interview. After conducting initial screening interviews, the search committee shall recommend to the Department a short list of candidates to be invited for campus presentations. All members of the Department are expected to attend the selected candidates' presentations. After all candidates have visited but before making its recommendation to the Department, the search committee shall invite all members of the Department to share with it their views on the candidates.

The committee shall then present its recommendation to the tenured and tenure-track faculty, who make the Department's formal recommendation for appointment. The chair forwards the recommendation to the Dean of CLASS and acts for the Department in negotiating the terms of the offer.

Appendix VI

History Department Civility Policy

Statement of Principles

The History Department at the University of Houston is committed to maintaining a welcoming, open, supportive and inclusive faculty community. It is a positive space in which diversity is supported and valued, and where freedom of speech is cherished and upheld. It seeks to promote a working, learning, and research environment where all members of our community—faculty, staff, and students—work together in a professional, mutually respectful environment. We dedicate ourselves to equally valuing all members of our community regardless of their background. According to the AAUP Statements on Professional Ethics “As colleagues, professors have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Professors do not discriminate against or harass colleagues. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associations, even when it leads to findings and conclusions that differ from their own.”⁹

Examples of Incivility

Incivility constitutes a breach of our community principles and standards that require all members of our department to treat each other with mutual respect and consideration. It could manifest itself in a wide range of behavior that includes observable intimidation or bullying, verbal or physical; expressions of racist, sexist, misogynistic or homophobic slurs and comments; observable threatening comments or actions; invasion of an individual’s personal space; as well as observable behavior, verbal or physical that causes offense, humiliation, emotional or physical harm. Microaggressions are examples of incivility as well. These regular and persistent statements communicate hostile, derogatory and negative slights. They often entail emphasizing the injured party’s racial, gender or sexual orientation differences, reminding the individual of their historic second-class status or symbolizing past and current stereotypes and injustices.¹⁰ Taken together, all of these actions and statements should be refrained from during all faculty and staff interactions anywhere, including in all faculty and standing committee meetings, in faculty offices and hallway encounters, encounters with staff and students, during hiring and personnel decisions, as well as cyber interactions.

Significantly, while the department will not tolerate incivility, it clearly recognizes the distinction between this form of conduct and critical behavior and speech.¹¹ Our community is sensitive to the fact that interpretations or concepts of incivility could be used in racialized or gendered ways, and have even been sometimes invoked to disempower those carrying dissenting

⁹ American Association of University Professors, “Statement of Professional Ethics, <https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-professional-ethics> (revised 2009).

¹⁰ Derald Wing Sue, *Microaggressions in Everyday Life*, 2010.

¹¹ American Association of University of Professors, “On Freedom of Expression and campus Speech Codes,” <https://www.aaup.org/report/freedom-expression-an-campus-speech-codes> (adopted nov.1994).

views or those belonging to minority communities. This is not the intention of this policy. Our position on civility and incivility is driven by a commitment to empower all members of our scholarly body, rather than to act as a cover for disempowering scholars belonging to backgrounds that experience systemic forms of discrimination. Our vision of civility is centered on the idea of mutual respect, rather than policing dissent or dissenting views. As such, accusations of incivility must not be made frivolously, and nor should selective notions of ‘civility’ be assembled in a manner aimed at marginalizing particular targets rather than ensuring an inclusive environment for all. This policy is concerned with protecting freedom of speech, and it shall not be arbitrarily used to abuse or retaliate against department faculty, staff, or students.

Procedures to be Followed

At any time, if the circumstances and findings warrant, proceedings for termination of appointment may be initiated in accordance with University of Houston Policy and/or any step below may be skipped. (Please see: UH Faculty Handbook, 85: www.fs.uh.edu)

1st observable offense—the chair will conduct an investigation, and in consultation with the Executive Committee determines if a violation has occurred. If an infraction was committed, a fact-finding report will be generated and placed in the faculty member’s file. The chair will advise the faculty member that the 2nd offense will show a pattern.

2nd Offense—will automatically generate a fact-finding report and a letter of reprimand from the chair and the EC. The report and letter will be added to faculty member’s file.

3rd offense—will generate another report and a letter, and both will be added to the faculty member’s file.

4th offense—will generate a report and a letter to the Dean and to the Provost. The violation will automatically cause the Merit Committee to subtract a full point from the faculty member’s annual performance review score. If merit is not available during the academic year of the committed observable offense, the one point deduction will be applied when merit is next available.

The Executive Committee will serve as the departmental disciplinary hearing committee. In cases of a conflict of interest involving a hearing committee member, that member must recuse him/herself.

The chair, with consultation of the Executive Committee, will determine and ensure that a penalty will reflect the nature and severity of the offense.

The University of Houston Faculty Handbook requires that all faculty and staff be treated fairly and consistently in all matters related to their employment.¹² As such, after an act of incivility has been reported, the chair and the EC will prepare a detailed written statement of the

¹² University of Houston Faculty Handbook, <http://www.uh.edu/campus/rep/fsenate/2007> Faculty Handbook security.pdf. 78.

allegations, which will serve as an official notification of the offense to the faculty member against whom the charges have been filed.

An inquiry supervised by the Chair and EC will ensue in order to determine the facts associated with the alleged offense. That investigation will include interviewing all parties involved as well as witnesses of the observable act of incivility. An effective decision will be made in a timely fashion if the sanctions detailed and attached to the above offenses 1-4 may be applied. In such a case, the faculty member can appeal the decision by submitting a written statement to the chair and EC, Dean and Provost. Such a right to appeal for every reported observable offense will protect the principles of due process as well as the constitutional rights of the individual.

(Recommend Retaining information under the heading of “Other campus resources”)

Equal Opportunity Services: www.uh.edu/legal-affairs/equal-opportunity/index.php

Human Resources: www.uh.edu/humanresource/

UH Faculty Handbook: www.fs.uh.edu

Campus police (743-3333): www.uh.edu/police/home.html

Appendix VII

Roberts Rules of Order (abbreviated version)

Quick Guide to Rules of Order

Based on Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised 10th Edition

Steps to Handle a Motion

- A member makes a motion
- Another member seconds the motion,
- The Chair states the motion, passing ownership of the motion to the assembly,
- The members debate the motion,
- The chair puts the question (motion) to a vote, and
- The chair announces the result and effect of the vote.

Making a Motion

The member must first get recognition by the Chair, stand, and “move” that the organization take action or a stand. The member that makes the motion, has the right to speak first to the motion if they wish, can not speak against their own motion, but can vote against their motion.

What is a “Second”?

A member who seconds a motion, only agrees to the consideration of the motion by the assembly, and may not in fact agree with the motion and may wish to speak against the motion in debate.

Rules of Debate

Every member has the right to speak to every debatable motion before it is finally acted upon, unless this right is interfered with by a two-thirds vote of the assembly.

A member has the right to make two speeches of ten minutes length per day on each debatable question, and to change the limits of debate requires a motion adopted by a two-thirds vote. No member can speak a second time before another member who has not yet spoken wishes to speak.

In debate, members should observe the following;

- 1 Confine remarks to the pending question,
- 2 Refrain from attacking a member's motives,
- 3 Address all remarks through the Chair,
- 4 Avoid the use of members' names,
- 5 Refrain from speaking against one's own motion,
- 6 Refrain from reading from papers or books, unless with permission of the assembly,
- 7 Be seated unless speaking, and
- 8 Refrain from disturbing the assembly.

The Chair must remain impartial during debate and should have nothing to say on the merits of a pending question. To participate in debate, the Chair must relinquish the chair.

For a longer version see: <http://www.robertsrules.org>