I. Preamble

The Department of History comprises a diverse faculty recruited both to reflect the pluralism within the profession and to provide students with opportunities to learn and to apply varying philosophies, theories, and interpretations of history. This pluralism requires members of the Department to approach professional evaluation with flexibility. The Department is committed to the teacher-scholar ideal. It encourages faculty to promote analysis and interpretation in history, to lead students toward more sophisticated concepts of history, to integrate advances in historical scholarship into the teaching process and to take responsible educational risks in instructional pedagogy as well as historical content.

In accordance with University policy, teaching effectiveness shall be the most important criterion for retention, tenure, and promotion of History Department faculty members. Second in importance shall be scholarly and creative activity. It should be noted that, while accepting these categorical emphases, the Department seeks to avoid any implicit or explicit dichotomy in the role of teacher-scholar, employing instead a symbiotic model, which assumes that scholarly competence and currency are essential components and elements of effective pedagogy. Further, the Department recognizes the valuable relationship between teaching, research, and professional service. Faculty members seeking retention, tenure, and/or promotion must therefore compile a satisfactory record of service.

The Department of History stipulates specific performance expectations in three broad categories: Teaching and Instructional Activities, Scholarly and Creative Activities, and Service to the Profession, Department, University, and Community. This document stipulates the types of evidence needed to document performance in each category. It also discusses how that evidence shall be evaluated and what performance standards must be met to achieve various recommendations in the personnel process. The guidelines set forward herein are an amplification of UPS 210.000, whose provisions must also be satisfied. In all areas where this document is silent, UPS 210.000 shall govern.
II. The Department Personnel Committee (DPC) and the RTP Process

A. Election to the DPC: Each Spring, all eligible tenured faculty members (except those on leave or those who will have a conflict of interest) are automatically nominated for election to the five-member DPC. All tenured and tenure-track members of the Department are eligible to vote for those candidates. Votes shall be cast by secret ballot, with those individuals who receive the fewest number of votes gradually eliminated until the committee is elected by majority vote. If elected, a faculty member must serve on the DPC. The committee chairperson shall be elected by the committee itself after it is constituted.

B. Term of Service: Individuals elected to the committee serve two-year terms with either two or three members elected annually. A tenured faculty member who serves a full term will be exempt from DPC service for one year.

C. DPC Responsibilities in the RTP Process: It shall review the evidence included in Portfolios submitted by candidates for retention, tenure, and/or promotion and prepare written performance evaluations based on that evidence. The DPC shall then use those evaluations as the basis for recommending appropriate personnel action. As stated in UPS 210.000, “Evaluations and Recommendations,” copies of the DPC’s evaluations and recommendations shall be provided to faculty members at each review level. In accordance with UPS 210.000, when reviewing a Portfolio for promotion consideration, DPC members must have a higher rank than the faculty member under review.

In cases where a Candidate for retention, tenure and/or promotion has been granted credit for prior service, the DPC’s evaluation shall include consideration of the Candidate’s accomplishments during the service credit years. However, the DPC shall weigh accomplishments achieved during probationary years at CSUF more heavily. (UPS 210.000, “Service Credit”)

III. Teaching and Instructional Activities

A. Expectations: The Department of History recognizes that effective teaching is central to the learning process. Members of the Department are thus expected to demonstrate effectiveness in three areas: Course Preparation, Communication with Students, and Continuing Commitment to Teaching Excellence.

B. Course Preparation
1. Definition: Preparation is defined as such activities as work done outside the classroom to create new courses, master course content, develop instructional goals, organize material for classroom presentation, create class web sites, and devise methods and criteria to assess student learning.

2. Evidence of Course Preparation may include but is not limited to the following:

a) Syllabi for all courses taught during the evaluation period.

b) Examples of quizzes, exams, paper assignments, and other evaluative instruments developed to assess student learning in those courses. (NOTE: Departmental policy stipulates that examinations and comparable exercises should be given with reasonable frequency and that they must include a significant written component.)

c) Examples of assessment criteria developed for each type of evaluative instrument included above.

d) Examples of supplementary materials (lecture outlines, course readers, worksheets, exam review materials, assignment guidelines, course web sites, etc.) prepared by the candidate to enhance student learning.

e) Copies of course proposals initiated by the candidate during the period under review.

f) Copies of grant proposals (funded and/or pending) initiated by the candidate for course development or revision.

g) Summaries of student comments about course materials as expressed on the History Departments "Student Rating of Instruction" (SRI) form for all classes taught during the period under review.

h) Student testimonials (including solicited and unsolicited letters as well as comments drawn from SRI forms).

C. Communication with Students

1. Definition: Communication with Students is defined as such activities as presenting course materials clearly and in a well-
organized manner; encouraging questions and/or discussion in the classroom; enabling discussion outside of class through observance of office hours and scheduled student appointments as well as reasonably prompt responses to student communications; and regular and substantive written feedback on examinations, paper drafts, and revisions.

2. Evidence of Communication with Students may include but is not limited to the following:

a) Statistical summaries of student responses to Questions Two, Three, and Six of the History Department's SRI form for all classes taught during the period under review. ["2. Did the Professor encourage questions and/or discussion?" "3. Did the Professor make him/herself available for individual assistance?" "6. Did the instructor present the course material in a clear and well organized manner?"]

b) At the discretion of the candidate, written peer evaluation of performance in the classroom.

c) Copies of student exams, paper drafts, and/or revisions showing the instructor’s critiques.

d) Copies of email correspondence with students.

e) Evidence of electronic bulletin board discussion with students and/or chat room logs.

f) Student testimonials (including solicited and unsolicited letters as well as comments drawn from SRI forms).

g) Logs of student advising activities.

D. Continuing Commitment to Teaching Excellence

1. Definition: Continuing Commitment to Teaching Excellence is defined as such activities as regular review of instructional materials and strategies; development of new courses and/or revision of existing curricular offerings to reflect new developments in the field; enhanced mastery of means to communicate course content to students, including new media; participation in teaching programs, symposia, training exercises and/or workshops; introduction and use of innovative classroom strategies.
2. Evidence of Continuing Commitment to Teaching Excellence may include but is not limited to the following:

a) Statistical summaries of student responses to Question One of the History Department's SRI form for all classes taught during the period under review. ["Did the course challenge you by providing new insights into the subject matter through the use of interpretation, analysis and/or comparison?"]

b) The numerical grading summaries of the Statistical Summary of grades are further evidence of assessment and excellence in teaching. Grading summaries will be evaluated in the context of all other evidences of teaching performance to establish that instruction is consistent with the high standards established by the Department.

c) At the discretion of the candidate, written peer evaluations of candidate performance in the classroom.

d) Copies of course syllabi, assignment guidelines, or other written materials that describe innovative classroom strategies such as collaborative learning exercises, small group projects, role playing exercises.

e) Copies of course proposals initiated by the candidate during the period under review.

f) Copies of grant proposals (funded and/or pending) initiated by the candidate for course development or revision.

g) Course web sites, CD-ROMS, copies of PowerPoint presentations and other examples of effective use of computer-assisted instructional materials.

h) Copies of course syllabi, lecture notes, assignment guidelines, or other written materials documenting use of audio/visual materials.

i) Documented participation in teaching with technology seminars.

j) Documented participation in the development of multimedia projects.
k) Documented participation in pedagogically-oriented group activities such as teaching programs, symposia, training exercises, and/or workshops, including workshops on assessment of student learning.

l) Documented participation in departmental team-teaching projects.

m) Documented participation in interdisciplinary collaborative teaching projects.

n) Creation of textbooks or anthologies designed for classroom use.

E. Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

1. Method of Assessment: It is neither possible nor desirable to attach simple quantitative measures to evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Thus, the overwhelming majority of evidence presented in the teaching section of the Portfolio shall be qualitatively evaluated by the DPC. The exception is where the Portfolio includes statistical summaries of quantitative data drawn from the History Department’s SRI form (as spelled out in paragraphs III.C.2.a and III.D.2.a, above). When considering those items, the DPC will evaluate the data as follows.

a) The History Department shall construct frequency distributions of responses to student evaluation questionnaires. When at least 70% of the total responses to relevant questions are B (3.0) or above, the candidate’s performance will be considered Outstanding. When 60% of the total responses are B or above, the candidate’s performance will be considered Satisfactory. When less than 60% of the relevant totals are B or above, the candidate’s performance will be considered Insufficient.

b) It should be emphasized that in no cases will statistical data alone be the sole basis for evaluation of teaching effectiveness.

F. Ratings: Candidates will receive an overall rating of Outstanding in Teaching Effectiveness if they are judged to be Outstanding in at least two of the three areas (i.e., Course Preparation, Communication with Students, and Continuing Commitment to Teaching Excellence) with a rating of at least Satisfactory in the third. A Satisfactory rating shall
require a Satisfactory or better evaluation in each of the three areas or Satisfactory in two areas and Outstanding in the third. A rating of Insufficient will result when a Candidate is judged Insufficient in one or more areas.

IV. Scholarly and Creative Activities

A. Expectations: Scholarship is a fundamental and necessary component of ongoing faculty intellectual development. Through engaging in scholarly and creative activities, faculty members create new knowledge and enhance their research and analytical skills. Research also is a means by which faculty members remain current with the literature in their field, thereby enhancing teaching and learning. Because the History Department recognizes the importance of scholarship, it expects all Candidates seeking retention, tenure, and/or promotion to offer evidence of ongoing scholarly and creative activities that periodically yield published results. Additionally, the Department expects faculty members to have an active research agenda that may include application for research grants, publication of book reviews, and presentation of scholarly papers at professional conferences.

B. Definitions:

1. “Scholarly works” shall be defined as (but are not limited to) monographs, textbooks, articles, book chapters, contributions to edited collections or anthologies, substantial review essays, CD-ROMs, web sites, conference papers, museum exhibits and accompanying catalogs, documentary films, and the end products of public and/or oral history projects.

2. “Peer review” shall be defined as pre-publication review by referees who are specialists in the field.

3. “Peer-reviewed publications” shall be defined as scholarly works that are published in either printed or electronic form by reputable academic publishers or under the auspices of recognized academic organizations. They also include scholarly works for which a Candidate served as editor or co-editor.

4. “In press” shall be defined as a scholarly work in the final stages of editing and production.

C. Evidence of Research and Creative Activities: may include but is not limited to documentation of the following accomplishments:
1. Publications

a) Copies of peer-reviewed publications.

Candidates must provide evidence of peer review for each publication included in the Portfolio. In cases where publications are in press, Candidates must include copies of galley proofs and/or a letter from the editor or publisher attesting to the fact that final revisions have been received. The same type of evidence is required for all in press items described below.

b) Copies of peer-reviewed scholarly works that have been provisionally accepted for publication. Candidates must provide evidence of acceptance in the form of copies of contracts and/or letters from editors and/or publishers. The same type of evidence is required for all provisionally accepted items described below.

c) Copies of scholarly works submitted for peer-reviewed publication. As stipulated in UPS 210.000, Candidates must provide letters of acknowledgment from editors and/or publishers attesting to the receipt and/or pending review of such manuscripts. The same type of evidence is required for all items described below as submitted for review.

d) Copies of completed or near completed scholarly works prepared for peer review and publication but not yet submitted. Candidates must include a statement explaining when the manuscript will be completed and to whom it will be submitted. The same type of statement is required for all items described below that will be submitted for review.

2. Research Grants

a) Copies of research grant proposals funded by external agencies. Candidates must provide letters from the granting agency attesting to the fact that the grant has been funded.

b) Copies of research grant proposals under review by external agencies. Candidates must provide letters of acknowledgment attesting to the receipt and/or pending review of such grant proposals.
c) Copies of funded intramural research grants.

d) Copies of intramural research grants under review.

3. Book Reviews

a) Copies of published book reviews.

b) Copies of book reviews submitted for publication.

c) Copies of book reviews prepared for publication but not yet submitted.

4. Peer-Reviewed Conference Papers

a) Copies of peer-reviewed conference papers presented or accepted for presentation.

b) Copies of conference papers under peer review.

c) Copies of conference papers prepared for peer review but not yet submitted.

5. Copies of materials attesting to Candidates’ scholarly participation in peer-reviewed public or oral history projects.

6. Copies of materials attesting to Candidates’ scholarly participation in non-traditional and/or emerging venues for scholarly and creative activity.

7. Copies of materials attesting to the editing of anthologies of original work in one’s field of study.

D. Evidence of Quality of Scholarly and Creative Activities: may include but is not limited to the following:

1. Documentation of prizes awarded to Candidates for scholarly works.

2. At the Candidate’s discretion, written peer evaluations of scholarly works.

3. Written testimonials from specialists in the Candidate’s field of study.
4. Copies of published reviews that evaluate the Candidate’s scholarly works.

5. The prestige of the organization or institution that published the Candidate’s scholarly works.

E. Evaluation of Effectiveness in Scholarly and Creative Activities

1. Method of Assessment: In determining Candidates’ effectiveness in scholarly and creative activities, the DPC shall evaluate both quantitatively and qualitatively the evidence presented in the Scholarly and Creative Activities portion of the Portfolio.

   a) Qualitative Assessment: In evaluating the quality of a Candidate’s scholarly output, the DPC shall consider especially the evidence described in section III.D. above. Beyond this, the DPC shall determine the extent to which the Candidate’s scholarship and creative activities have substantial, demonstrable impact on the faculty member’s field(s) of specialization. Further, it shall consider the degree to which the Candidate’s scholarly works represent new contributions as opposed to being restatements of prior works. The DPC shall recognize that, while a Candidate’s scholarly agenda may evolve over the course of a career, to be considered in the Portfolio, publications must fit into the genre of historical scholarship.

   b) Quantitative Assessment: In general, as stated above, the most important evidence of effectiveness in scholarly and creative activities is peer-reviewed publication. In evaluating the quantity of a Candidate’s scholarly output, the DPC shall give primary consideration to the number of peer-reviewed publications included in the Portfolio. Of secondary importance is the number of completed scholarly works under peer-review as well as funded research grants, published book reviews, and conference presentations. Considered to a lesser extent will be scholarly works in preparation as well as pending research grants, book reviews, and conference papers.

   c) Editing or co-editing a peer-reviewed collection of scholarly articles, documents, or translations will be considered equivalent to the publication of one scholarly article. Equivalence to publication in the case of non-
traditional work shall be determined by the DPC on a case-by-case basis.

d) Conference papers, intramural research grants, book reviews, and unpublished manuscripts may be submitted as evidence of ongoing research but are not in lieu of published scholarship sufficient to merit promotion or tenure although they may be sufficient to merit retention in the early years of probation.

e) While quantitative measures will be applied to the evaluation of a Candidate’s effectiveness in Scholarly and Creative Activities, the DPC will nonetheless bear in mind that the pace and nature of scholarship varies significantly from historian to historian. Such factors as field of research, accessibility of historical sources, and the availability of financial support can significantly impact the rate at which a faculty member can produce scholarly works. In assessing the Portfolios of Candidates for retention, tenure, and/or promotion, the DPC shall thus consider the degree of difficulty the author has encountered in obtaining access to the source materials utilized in the research as well as the material’s geographic proximity. Further, the DPC shall recognize the time implications involved when a Candidate’s scholarly project involves substantial travel and reliance on sources that are in non-native language(s). If such factors cause unexpected delays or otherwise unduly hamper progress toward fulfillment of the Candidate’s research agenda, the DPC may choose to relax its normal quantitative expectations.

2. Ratings

a) A Candidate for Retention shall be evaluated as Outstanding when making better than expected progress toward meeting all the requirements of the Department Personnel Guidelines and UPS 210.000. A Satisfactory rating will result when a Candidate is meeting all the requirements of the Department Personnel Guidelines and UPS 210.000 at the expected rate. A Candidate will be judged Insufficient when making little to no discernable
progress toward meeting all the requirements of the Department Personnel Guidelines and UPS 210.000.

b) A Candidate for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor shall be evaluated as Outstanding when the Candidate has published at least three peer-reviewed articles, chapters in edited anthologies, and the like, and/or a peer-reviewed monograph published in high quality journals or with a high quality press in the author’s field and has otherwise actively worked to fulfill all the requirements of the Department Personnel Guidelines and UPS 210.000 by applying for research grants, publishing book reviews, or presenting scholarly papers at professional conferences. To be deemed Satisfactory, a Candidate must have published at least two peer-reviewed articles as well as actively worked to meet all the requirements of the Department Personnel Guidelines and UPS 210.000. An Insufficient rating will result when a Candidate has published fewer than two peer-reviewed articles and/or shows little progress toward meeting all the requirements of the Department Personnel Guidelines and UPS 210.000.

c) A Candidate for promotion to Professor will be evaluated as Outstanding after publishing a peer-reviewed scholarly monograph or more than three peer-reviewed articles after achieving promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and has otherwise demonstrated evidence of continuing commitment to scholarly activity. To be deemed Satisfactory, a Candidate must have published three peer-reviewed articles and has otherwise demonstrated evidence of continuing commitment to scholarly activity. An Insufficient rating will result if a Candidate has published fewer than three peer-reviewed articles and demonstrated little evidence of commitment to scholarly activity.

V. Service to the Profession, Department, University, and Community

A. Expectations: The Department of History views service as an important component of faculty life. The Department thus expects faculty members to provide service in two categories: to the profession, and to the department, university, and community. The Department believes faculty members at all career stages should participate in professional organizations and activities relevant to their
teaching and research fields. It also expects that faculty members, especially those who are tenured, will play an active and continuing role in the governance of the department and university. Further, it encourages faculty members, especially those who are more senior, to use their skills and expertise for the betterment of the community.

B. Definitions:

1. “Service to the Profession” is defined as activities that further the goals of the profession and its constituent organizations.

2. “Service to the Department and University” is defined as activities that further the goals of these entities.

3. “Service to the Community” is defined as activities that contribute to the intellectual enrichment and general well being of the communities comprising the university’s regional service area.

C. Evidence of Service to the Profession: may include but is not limited to documentation of the following accomplishments:

1. Membership in and attendance at the meetings of relevant professional organizations.

2. Non-peer-reviewed participation (as, e.g., chair, commentator, discussant) in relevant professional forums such as conferences, symposia, colloquia, workshops and the like.

3. Holding office in relevant professional organizations.

4. Participation on a program or arrangements committee for a professional organization.

5. Service as an editor or editorial board member for a relevant press, journal, or newsletter.

6. Participation in relevant non-peer-reviewed grant or contract work.

7. Service as an external referee for scholarly manuscripts, textbooks, public history projects, grants, and academic promotions.

D. Evidence of Service to the Department, University, and Community: may include but is not limited to documentation of the following
accomplishments.

1. Attendance at and participation in departmental meetings and committees and service in departmental offices.

2. Participation in college and university committees, boards, and offices.

3. Service as a mentor for faculty members and/or students.

4. Presentations of lectures, addresses, or programs to department, college, and university audiences.

5. Sponsorship or advisement of departmental or extra-departmental student organizations.

6. Presentations of lectures to community groups.

7. Service as an active or honorary member of community organizations.

8. Appointment to community task forces, advancement projects, or other improvement initiatives.

E. Evaluation of Effectiveness in Service to the Profession, Department, University and Community

1. Method of Assessment: In determining a Candidate’s effectiveness in service to the profession, department, university, and community, the DPC shall evaluate both quantitatively and qualitatively the evidence presented in the Service section of the Portfolio. The DPC shall seek to establish the quality of a Candidate’s service by making note of laudatory comments found within the submitted documentation. That documentation may take the form of letters of appointment, acknowledgments, major policy documents, reports, programs, minutes, awards, honors, commendations, articles in newspapers or professional newsletters, testimonials, or letters of appreciation.

2. Ratings: A Candidate will be rated Outstanding if the faculty member demonstrates high quality service in a total of four service areas. To be deemed Satisfactory, a Candidate must have demonstrated some commitment to service by participating in a total of three service areas, including items drawn from each of the broad service categories. An Insufficient rating will result if
a Candidate demonstrates little to no commitment to service or whose service is deemed to be of particularly low quality.

VI. Recommendations in the RTP Process

A. **To be recommended for retention during the probationary period**: a Candidate must receive at least a Satisfactory rating in all three broad evaluative categories described in this document: Teaching and Instructional Activities; Scholarly and Creative Activities; and Service to the Profession, Department, University and Community. To be recommended highly, a Candidate must be rated as Outstanding in Teaching and at least Satisfactory in the other two evaluative categories. During the probationary period, the faculty member must demonstrate progress toward meeting the requirements for tenure and promotion.

B. **To be recommended for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor**: a Candidate must be rated as Outstanding in Teaching and at least Satisfactory in the other two evaluative categories. To be recommended highly, a Candidate must be rated as Outstanding in Teaching and at least one of the other two evaluative categories and at least Satisfactory in the third.

C. **To be recommended for early tenure and/or promotion**: a Candidate must be Outstanding in all three evaluative categories.

D. **To be recommended for promotion to Professor**: a Candidate must be Outstanding in Teaching and at least one of the other two evaluative categories with at least a Satisfactory rating in the third. To be recommended highly, a Candidate must be rated as Outstanding in all three evaluative categories.

E. **To be recommended for early promotion to Professor**: a Candidate must be Outstanding in all three evaluative categories.

VII. Preparation of the Developmental Narrative, and the Portfolio

A. During the first year of employment in a tenure-track position, each probationary faculty member shall write a prospective Developmental Narrative for teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service, not to exceed 500 words each. These narratives shall describe the faculty member’s professional goals, areas of interest, resources required, and accomplishments the faculty member expects to achieve in each of the three areas in order to meet the requirements of these Department Personnel Guidelines and UPS 210.000 for retention, tenure, and promotion. The Developmental
Narrative will be reviewed by the department chair and the dean, who will each provide feedback on a timetable to be determined by the college dean, with a final draft to be completed prior to May 1. The Developmental Narrative shall be included in the faculty member’s Portfolio that is submitted for retention review during the second year in the tenure-track position. The Department shall assist probationary faculty members in the preparation of the Developmental Narrative that meet the guidelines and provisions set out in this document and UPS 210.000. Specifically, the Department Chair, in consultation with the probationary faculty member, shall designate a consenting mentor whose responsibility shall be to provide guidance, advice and support for the faculty member during the probationary period, especially in terms of preparing the Developmental Narrative. The Department Chair shall appoint a different mentor at any time that the probationary faculty member makes such a request. The Department Chair may consult with the DPC before appointing a mentor acceptable to the probationary faculty member.

B. The primary responsibility of the mentor is to provide guidance, advice, and support to the probationary faculty member during the preparation of the Developmental Narrative. When putting together the Developmental Narrative, the Candidate and mentor should explicitly relate the Developmental Narrative to the Department’s expectations as set out in this document, bearing in mind especially the performance requirements specified for retention, tenure, and promotion.

C. The Developmental Narrative will be reviewed by the Department Chair, DPC, and the Dean of the College of Humanities and Social Sciences as set out in subsection A of this section and provided for in UPS 210.000. The probationary faculty member may revise the Developmental Narrative in response to comments from any of those who evaluate it, and to reflect changes and professional growth that will normally occur during the probationary period.

D. For those faculty who have approved Development Plans, progress toward retention, tenure and promotion will be measured against expectations stated in UPS 210.000 and Department Personnel Guidelines (Reference UPS 210.000 IV.F. – H).

E. The Portfolio is the functional equivalent of the Working Personnel Action File. It is a cumulative record that shall contain evidence of performance specified in Sections III, IV, and V, for all of the years under review, and various forms. The Portfolio is compiled by the
faculty member to be evaluated. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to be sure the Portfolio is current and complete before it is submitted to the department chair or dean. Evaluations, recommendations, and rebuttals, if any, are added at the various levels of review.