

Department Standards: Retention, Promotion and Tenure

SUMMARY

The Department of History Personnel Committee will follow the timetable and procedures outlined in the FPPP in preparing its reports on retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP). Each written assessment will include a summary of appointment status and time-in-rank and reviews of the faculty member's record of Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Service that Contributes to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, and University as well as the Community. In performance review reports, these reviews will conclude with summary evaluations of either Exceeds expectations, Meets expectations, or Does not meet expectations (defined in FPPP).

SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES

This section will describe special circumstances that may relate to the faculty member under review.

1. **Joint Appointments:** In cases of interdisciplinary hires, a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the two departments/units would be established defining the criteria for RTP assessment unique to such exceptional positions at the time of the hire. A copy of the MOU will be placed in the candidate's Personnel Action File. During the candidate's first evaluation cycle, the Department of History Personnel Committee, the candidate, and the other department/unit will address and resolve in a written memorandum any disagreements or inconsistencies related to the criteria for RTP assessment for each joint appointment.
2. **External Reviewers:** The Department of History Personnel Committee acknowledges that external reviewers could have value in individual assessments, but with two qualifications: 1) utilization of an outside reviewer should be an acceptable option to the Personnel Committee; and 2) use of an outside reviewer would require the prior agreement of the person under review.

Evaluation of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty

INSTRUCTION

Effective teaching is the minimum and indispensable requirement for retention,

tenure, and promotion in the Department of History. The primary criteria for assessment of teaching in unprioritized order include:

1. knowledge of the field;
2. classroom visitation reports. Normally, one classroom visitation per review period will suffice. However, under certain circumstances, the Personnel Committee may decide that more than one classroom visitation is necessary during a review cycle.
3. statement of teaching philosophy, syllabi, assigned readings, papers, and examinations as well as graded examples of papers and tests. In the case of online courses taught asynchronously, the portfolio should include transcripts of his/her interactions with students. If recorded "lectures" are available to students as part of an online course, the portfolio should include a sample of these recordings;
4. contributions to the graduate program (for example, teaching in graduate education, service on graduate student committees, oversight of graduate independent study courses, and participation on thesis committees or oral examinations);
5. peer evaluations;
6. student achievements;
7. contributions to elements of the Strategic Plan, such as involvement with K-12 education, involvement with General Education, and other campus initiatives;
8. student outcome assessments;
9. course redesign for student success, as demonstrated by revised syllabi and/or participation in Faculty Learning Communities, Pedagogy Workshops, Teaching Academies, etc.
10. student evaluations.

PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND ACHIEVEMENT

Evidence of professional growth and achievement is judged by a candidate's record of production of original scholarship in their subfield of history. Candidates may demonstrate scholarly achievement in the production of peer-reviewed books, articles, book chapters in edited volumes, translations, and book reviews; papers presented at professional meetings and participation as conference panel chair and/or commentator; and/or work presented and/or published in other formats (e.g., public history, oral history, digital history, etc.).

Grants, awards, honors, and fellowships also will be considered as evidence of professional growth and achievement, although grants alternatively may be counted as Other Contributions to the University. Unpublished evidence of scholarship may be considered and evaluated as indicative of the candidate's potential for growth. Additional evidence includes text and journal referee assignments and consultancies.

Normally, three peer-reviewed articles or the combined equivalent of such scholarship as peer-reviewed articles and book chapters; major translated work; major public, oral, or digital history projects; and demonstrable, verifiable progress toward the acceptance for publication of a scholarly book, are required for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor. A scholarly book, written by the probationary faculty member and published by a university press or the equivalent, also meets this standard.

Normally, promotion to full professor will require additional significant scholarly output, which may take the form of peer-reviewed articles and book chapters; major translated work; major public, oral, or digital history projects; or a scholarly book published by a university press or the equivalent.

In most historical subfields, candidates for full professor will have written a scholarly book, published by a university press or the equivalent, either as an assistant or associate professor. Exceptions to this expectation can be granted on a case by case basis.

It is also expected that candidates for tenure, and for promotion, either to associate professor or to full professor, will have demonstrated regular and active engagement in the historical profession by publishing book reviews; attending academic conferences; delivering conference papers or invited guest lectures; serving as conference session chairs or commenters; reviewing book manuscripts for publishers; and/or reviewing article manuscripts for professional journals.

Given that Chico State values the teacher-scholar model, full professors are expected to continue their professional engagement with the scholarly community.

The Committee will not recommend retention or tenure for a candidate who has not completed the doctorate within two years of the initial appointment in the Department of History.

SERVICE

The prime criterion for judgment is participation in the business of the Department, which includes, but is not limited to, attending faculty meetings, serving on faculty committees, participating in hiring procedures, academic advising, and advising and supporting student organizations. After Department service, in descending order of importance are: a) college and university assignments; b) assigned time, reimbursed time, and joint or administrative appointments; and, c) professional contributions to community, regional, or national organizations.

RTP CONFORMITY

Each faculty member undergoing the RTP process will update his or her Dossier on an annual basis. The Dossier is an attachment to the Working Personal Action File (WPAF) housed in the College of HFA and should be submitted to the HFA office by

the deadlines established for each RTP cycle. The Dossier shall contain the following material:

1. a copy of the Department Standards;
2. a current curriculum vita;
3. a narrative providing a context for the reviewers to understand and evaluate the candidate's activities and achievements noted in the dossier. At a minimum, the narrative should include a reflective statement on the candidate's teaching effectiveness and professional development; and support materials for each of the three sections under evaluation (Instruction; Professional Growth and Achievement; and Service). Support materials should be arranged in accordance with the criteria of the FPPP and CFA's Handbook for the College Personnel File and Personnel Process.

Additional supporting materials should be submitted to the Department of History office and should be organized similarly to the Dossier with a table of contents. This table of contents of additional supporting materials should also appear in the support materials section of the Dossier.

Evaluation of Temporary Faculty

INSTRUCTION

Effective teaching is the minimum and indispensable requirement for retention and range elevation in the Department of History. The primary criteria for assessment of teaching are the same as those listed above for tenure-track and tenured faculty (with the exception of #4).

CURRENCY IN THE FIELD

Instructors are expected to demonstrate currency in their respective fields. Evidence of currency in the field include, but are not limited, to the following:

1. subscription to academic journals;
2. attending academic conferences and workshops;
3. new readings incorporated into course syllabi;
4. curriculum or new course development
5. Reviewing new textbook manuscripts and/or other classroom instructional materials for publishers

RANGE ELEVATION FOR TEMPORARY FACULTY

Temporary faculty can request range elevation in accordance with the guidelines outlined in FPPP section 12.0 and CBA Article 12.16-20.







Department Standards Approval Sheet

Process:

- a) Department votes, if approved, Department Chair/Director submits to College Dean for review and approval;
- b) College Dean reviews, consults with Department Chair/Director regarding questions/ issues, then forwards Dean approved Word document to OAPL via email for review;
- c) OAPL reviews for compliance with CBA/FPPP, consults with the dean, then forwards OAPL approved document to Provost for approval;
- d) Provost reviews and approves, recommending changes if necessary, then returns approved document to OAPL.
- e) If not approved, OAPL forwards requested changes for revision and re-submission.
- f) If approved, OAPL adds *Provost Approved Date* footnote to page 1 of the document:
 - a. Routes this approval sheet with approved Standard for signatures via Adobe Sign,
 - b. Uploads document to OAPL Department Standards website, and
 - c. Informs Dean and Department Chair/Director of approval with link to OAPL website location.

Approvals:

Chair/Director:	 <small>Robert Tinkler (Aug 31, 2022 13:49 PDT)</small>	Date:	Aug 31, 2022
Dean:		Date:	Aug 31, 2022
OAPL:		Date:	Sep 2, 2022
Provost:		Date:	Sep 2, 2022



MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 30, 2022
TO: Robert Tinkler, Department Chair
CC: Tracy Butts, Dean
FROM: Mahalley D. Allen, Associate Vice President for Academic Personnel
SUBJECT: Provisional Approval of HIST Department RTP Standards

Thank you for submitting revised department RTP standards incorporating the [three new evaluation ratings](#) in each area of faculty performance.

Provost Larson has provisionally approved the attached department standards for the 2022-2023 academic year. This approval is provisional, and your department needs to address and revise specific areas of your standards as noted in the document's comments and tracked changes. In addition, we have called out here critical items that must be addressed:

- Resolve question on who is an external reviewer and be consistent with the FPPP.
- Develop criteria/standards for instruction of what is expected from the data sources listed. Please delineate standards between meets, exceeds, and does not meet?
- Resolve comments on the criteria for professional growth and scholarship. Define when a candidate does not meet expectations.
- Spell out the meet, exceeds, does not meet for the service paragraph.

Based on our review of recently submitted department standards, we offer these general observations, which we highly recommend departments consider as they work on revising their provisionally approved standards.

1. According to FPPP 10.3.3, an evaluation of meets expectations is the minimum level of overall achievement consistent with the awarding of tenure and/or promotion. Evaluations of exceeds expectations shall be concluded only when faculty performance has clearly exceeded the requirements for obtaining tenure and/or promotion.
2. FPPP 10.5 requires a higher standard for obtaining accelerated tenure and/or promotion at the rank of assistant to associate. Not only must faculty be evaluated as exceeding expectations in all three categories of evaluation, but they must also demonstrate the likelihood that this high level of performance will continue, and they must have worked a minimum of one academic year under the conditions similar to their department's typical full-time assignment. FPPP 11.1.3 applies to accelerated promotion to professor that includes the requirement that the candidate demonstrate substantial potential recognition at and beyond the University itself.

3. Departments need to develop clear definitions and criteria for the three evaluation ratings in each area of performance. Clearly defined expectations provide fair and necessary guidance for faculty undergoing review and encourage professional growth.
4. We encourage departments to consider differential expectations for faculty members as a function of time in rank. The criteria for an evaluation of meets expectations in service, for example, may be different for retention of probationary faculty than for the granting of tenure. Similarly, the criteria for an evaluation of meets expectations in professional growth and achievement may be different for promotion to associate professor than for promotion to full professor.

Please submit your revisions, with tracked changes, to our office no later than Monday, January 23, 2023, so that the Office of Academic Personnel and Provost Larson have adequate time to review the revisions prior to the start of the 2023-2024 academic year. If revisions are not received by that date, your department standards will revert to the version posted prior to this submission.

Our office will route for signatures your provisionally approved department standards in Adobe Sign and will post them to the [Department Standards page](#). You may now provide these provisionally approved standards to faculty in your department.