

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
CRITERIA FOR PERSONNEL REVIEWS

Revised:
February 28, 1997
August 19, 1998
August 28, 2002
April 24, 2012
August 20, 2014
October 19, 2015

I. GENERAL CRITERIA

- A. Pretenure reviews, evaluations for tenure and/or promotion, annual merit reviews, and periodic career reviews of tenured faculty shall be based upon faculty performance in the areas of teaching, research and creative activity, and service.
- B. Each personnel action shall be taken in light of the department's mission and variable career emphasis contained in the faculty member's Annual Work Plan(s) and curriculum vitae for the review period.

II. TEACHING

- A. Evaluation of teaching shall take into consideration (where appropriate):
 - 1. Teaching in regularly scheduled classes.
 - 2. Counseling of students outside of class.
 - 3. Guidance of advanced students in independent research and reading.
 - 4. Revision of courses, creation of new courses, and introduction of new methods and materials.
 - 5. Overall contribution to the development of the Department's curriculum.
 - 6. Awards for teaching and other extraordinary evidence of quality in teaching.
- B. Documentation for the evaluation of teaching must include:
 - 1. In pretenure, tenure and promotion cases, reports resulting from peer evaluation of classroom teaching as detailed in Section E.

2. Numerical results of college-wide student evaluation forms.
3. Copies of syllabi..

C. Documentation for the evaluation of teaching may include:

1. Copies of tests or teaching materials prepared by the faculty member and any explanation that the faculty member may wish to include.
2. Narrative portion of college-wide student evaluation forms.
3. A report by the faculty member on any special projects in the development of new courses, teaching materials or curricula during the review period. When appropriate, such reports may be supported by letters from faculty colleagues who have direct experience of the candidate's work (this will apply particularly to team-taught or interdisciplinary courses or programs).

D. Guidelines for evaluating materials:

The Department shall base its interpretation of student evaluation forms on Department or College-wide norms, if these have been established for the review period in question.

In the overall evaluation of the evidence the Department shall consider the following criteria:

1. The faculty member's fulfillment of teaching responsibilities (e.g., regular class meetings, availability to students outside of class, fair grading and testing procedures) which can be ascertained through student evaluations and complaints, and the examination of syllabi.
2. The faculty member's ability to organize material, to present it in a lucid and interesting way, and to establish the relationship of individual topics to broader general ideas, for which student evaluations will serve as the primary evidence, supplemented, where appropriate, by peer reviews.
3. The faculty member's command of the field and his/her efforts to keep up with new developments in it, which can be assessed by the examination of syllabi and records of professional activity.
4. The faculty member's ability to teach at different levels (except where the teaching load requires teaching on only one level). The evidence for this will be the record of classes taught by each faculty member.
5. The faculty member's willingness to contribute to the curricular development of the Department. Evidence for this will be the development of new courses, the

revision of existing courses and service on our undergraduate and graduate committees.

6. Contributions to Pedagogy. Where applicable, the Department will consider the following activities in its personnel review:
 - a. Extramural publication of textbooks.
 - b. Extramural publication of teaching materials (e.g., teachers' guides, examination question booklets, audiotapes, videotapes, dvds, on-line resources, etc) Conducting symposia, workshops, or continuing consultations involving educators.
 - c. Extramural publication of pedagogical materials.

E. Classroom Evaluation of Teaching:

1. Reports resulting from peer evaluation of classroom teaching conducted during the previous twelve months shall be included in the file of reviewees in years when they are being considered for pretenure, tenure and promotion. However, faculty members may request that peer evaluation be conducted in any year and that the resulting reports be included in the file.
2. Only tenured faculty shall evaluate teaching. Neither the Department Chair nor the members of the Department Personnel Committee shall act as evaluators.
3. Each faculty member shall be evaluated by two persons whose names shall be selected by lottery from the pool of eligible evaluators. The faculty member shall have the right confidentially to challenge the appropriateness of the persons chosen. Requests for subsequent drawings shall be addressed to the Department Chair or to the Personnel Committee. Each individual shall be allowed a reasonable number of drawings.
4. The courses to be visited and the dates of such visits will be arranged with the mutual consent of the faculty member and the evaluator. Before the visit the two will discuss the content of the course as a whole and the objectives of the class session to be observed.
5. Each evaluator shall visit two courses and, where the reviewee teaches at more than one course level, the courses shall be at different levels. Both evaluators shall visit the same two courses.
6. Within five working days of the visit, each evaluator shall submit a written report on each class visited to the Department Chair. A copy of these reports shall also be sent to the faculty member who has been evaluated.
7. Upon receiving a copy of such a report, the faculty member has two options: 1) to

indicate acceptance by returning a signed copy to the Chair, or 2) to write a rebuttal.

8. A second evaluation may be granted if the Chair has any reason to believe that the first was unfair. The Chair's decision may be appealed to the Department Personnel Committee.

III. RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY

Scholarship is a process that involves original research, contextualization in relevant historical literature, interpretation and argument based on primary sources, and presentation in a logical and coherent manner. Scholarship may take a variety of forms. Professional historical scholarship must be peer reviewed or open to peer review to ascertain its quality and contribution. In order to facilitate that review, the scholarship must be accessible to a scholarly audience in some form.

A. Scholarship. The Department recognizes the following categories:

1. Scholarly books, chapters in books, and articles, published or accepted for publication.
2. Presentations made at scholarly conferences, and other invited scholarly presentations.
3. Scholarship presented in the public arena or to a public agency such as, but not limited to, nominations to the National Register of Historic Places, exhibits for which the faculty member was the sole or co-curator, or digital public history scholarship. When judged necessary by the personnel committee, the faculty member may be required to describe the scholarship created and its significance.
4. Scholarly materials intended for publication, whether in draft or submitted, including book manuscripts, chapters of books, and articles. The faculty member may be asked to demonstrate the intended venue for the publication and an estimated date for publication.
5. Reasonable progress on a long-term project, to be described in a progress report submitted by the faculty member. The Personnel Committee shall be authorized to request evidence, such as grant applications, research notes, or other materials which substantiate the report.

NOTE: For the purpose of interpreting Section III. A. the term “publication” shall be understood to include both print and non-print materials. In all cases, the key to defining such activities is that they must be tied directly to one's area of expertise

and must be either peer-reviewed or open to peer review.

B. Evaluation of Materials.

The materials submitted will be evaluated with respect to both quality and quantity, according to the following guidelines:

1. The judgment of quality depends upon relevant evidence gathered in the process of review.
 - a. Written extramural evaluation shall be included in tenure and promotion cases and may be included in other cases.
 - b. Evidence of quality may also arise and enter the review process from other sources: e.g., awards conferred on particular works; publications and acceptance for publication in major journals using a system of referees; reviews in major journals of publications or public history scholarship by the faculty member under review; acceptance of papers by major professional conferences and learned societies using a system of referees, etc.
2. Quantity will be judged according to the following expectations:
 - a. All candidates for pretenure, tenure and promotion must present a body of work for extramural review.
 - b. Candidates for pretenure, tenure and promotion are required to present work in the field of their scholarship.

IV. SERVICE

This category does not require that the activity be related to one's area of expertise, but service is restricted to activities required by the students, department, college, university, or community service or service to the profession specifically related to professional competence as a historian. Service does not include, therefore, activities that one might engage in as a citizen of a civic community. Service to professional associations is considered service whenever such activity is not properly considered as scholarship.

V. ANNUAL REVIEW

- A. Each faculty member shall be reviewed annually. The review covers the three years running up to the most recent December 31. To facilitate the work of the Personnel Committee, each faculty member shall present evidence of work accomplished or produced in the previous three years, ending December 31 of the review year (this includes copies of published material); and shall submit a curriculum vitae in a standard form, marked with asterisks indicating work accomplished or produced within the

previous three years.

- B. Personnel files submitted for review shall contain, at a minimum, a curriculum vitae in a standard form and evidence of work in the previous three years as specified in V.A. above; Annual Work Plans for the previous three years; student evaluation summaries; and other evidence related to teaching as specified in II. B. and II. C. above. The Department Personnel Committee or the Chair may request additional materials, and these materials shall be supplied by the reviewee. The reviewee may also submit additional materials as he or she desires.
- C. The Department Chair and the Personnel Committee will provide guidance in the assembly of personnel files, but it is the responsibility of reviewees to insure the completeness of their files. No additional materials or markings may be added after the Departmental Personnel Committee begins the consideration of any faculty member for merit review in any given year, unless requested by the Committee.
- D. Evaluation of performance shall take into consideration the faculty member's pattern of career accomplishments and the stage of the faculty member's career. This review shall be an overall assessment of each faculty member's performance and shall take into consideration how this performance has contributed to the collective mission of the Department, College, University, and profession.
- E. Evaluation of Performance of Faculty Members with Administrative Appointments, which in the History Department is defined as individuals holding administrative appointments to which they have been appointed by the Board of Trustees on the recommendation of the President.
 - 1. The professional activity, teaching, and service of the faculty member, with the exception of service within the area of administrative appointment, shall be evaluated in the same manner as other faculty members.
 - 2. In addition, the administrative service of the faculty member will be reviewed with the following procedure:
 - a) The administrative faculty member will prepare a written report (maximum of two single spaced pages) summarizing accomplishments in the three year period under review.
 - b) The Personnel Committee will distribute to all faculty members and departmental staff (Unit Business Manager and Program Assistant) a brief questionnaire about the administrative faculty member's performance in the three year period under review. These comments will be anonymous.
 - c) The Personnel Committee will evaluate this evidence of the administrative faculty member's performance and include it in the overall merit review.
 - d) The Personnel Committee will deliver to the administrative faculty member its merit evaluation, along with the completed faculty and staff evaluations.

F. For faculty in the first year at the University, the material associated with the hiring process shall be included in the review.

G. Merit review Scale.

1. In order to receive an evaluation of "Proficient," individuals must perform at a generally satisfactory level, taking into consideration their Annual Work Plan commitments.
2. In order to receive an evaluation of "Highly Proficient," the faculty member must perform at a level above that of "Proficient," taking into consideration his or her Annual Work Plan commitments. He or she must be performing above departmental norms..
3. In order for a faculty member's performance to be rated "Exceptional," an overall assessment of that faculty member's record must reveal that he or she is performing substantially above departmental norms, taking into consideration his or her Annual Work Plan commitments. This award demands a high standard of evidence. This evidence may include, *but is not restricted to*, publication of original books, professional awards given on the basis of teaching and/or scholarship, significant fellowships and grants, invitations to deliver key-note addresses for national or international scholarly or professional organizations, and other significant indications of accomplishment in the faculty member's field
4. A rating of not proficient will be assigned to any faculty member who fails to meet responsibilities outlined by the Annual Work Plan in any of the three categories at a generally satisfactory level compared to departmental norms.

H. In years when there is a merit raise pool, the monetary value of each _____ Performance Evaluation and Salary Distribution (PESD) point shall be calculated one-half on the basis of an equal distribution of money to each qualified faculty member and one-half on the basis of an equal percentage of the base salary of each qualified faculty member.

Not Proficient	0 points
Proficient	1 point
Highly Proficient	2 points
Exceptional	3 points

VII. PERIODIC REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY

In these reviews, proficient performance shall be defined as continued overall performance at a general level of at least "Proficient" in the previous five annual reviews as determined by the Dean of the College.

VIII. EVALUATION OF PART-TIME FACULTY

- A. A teaching evaluation shall be required for all part-time instructors in the Department of History. This evaluation shall be based upon a review of course material distributed by the instructor and a review of course evaluation forms.
- B. Departmental evaluation forms shall be submitted for each class taught by the instructor.
- C. All part-time instructors must be evaluated through classroom visitation during their first semester of teaching in the Department of History. Part-time instructors will be evaluated a second time no later than the sixth semester in which they are teaching for the Department. Additional classroom evaluations may be conducted at the discretion of the Chair of the Department.
- D. Classroom evaluators must be tenured or tenure-track faculty members of the Department of History. The Chair and the Vice-Chair of the Department shall be excluded from the pool of evaluators.
- E. The classroom evaluation shall consist of reports by two evaluators, each of whom shall visit one class session. The two evaluators shall not evaluate the same session. The classroom visit shall occur during a period of three weeks agreed upon by the evaluator and the instructor. The evaluator, without prior notice to the instructor, shall visit any class session scheduled during this period except those identified in advance by the instructor as unsuitable for evaluation (because of scheduled tests, film showings, or other special events).
- F. The evaluator shall prepare a written report which shall include comments on the following aspects of the session observed:
 - Clarity of the instructor's presentation.
 - Instructor's responsiveness to students' questions.
 - Appropriateness of the material taught in the course (as reflected in the course syllabus) to the aims of the course.
- G. The report shall be submitted to the Chair of the Department of History, who shall forward a copy to the instructor. Instructors shall have the right to submit a written response to the report which shall be inserted in their files along with the reports themselves. At the request of the instructor, the Chair may order a further evaluation by another evaluator if there is any reason to believe that either of the evaluations submitted is unfair or biased.
- H. When possible, the Chair shall appoint Americanists to evaluate instructors teaching in the American survey program, and Civilizations faculty to evaluate those teaching in the Civilization program.

- I. In accordance with College procedure, the Chair will write an annual evaluation of each part-time instructor based on teaching evaluations and evaluation of other evidence as appropriate.