


DATE: August 19, 2015

TO: Richard Horowitz, Chair
Department of History

FROM: Sheila Grant, Chair 
Personnel Planning and Review Committee (PP&R)

SUBJECT: Department Personnel Procedures Approval

The Personnel Planning and Review Committee has approved your Department Personnel Procedures submitted during 2014-15 academic year. The non-RTP policies in the new Procedures are effective beginning with the 2015-16 academic year. However, if the Department changed the criteria for retention, tenure or promotion in the Procedures, those criteria will not become effective until the beginning of the 2018-19 academic year. During this three-year period, all candidates appointed before the approval by PP&R of the new Department Personnel Procedures shall be evaluated under the old criteria unless a candidate specifically elects to be evaluated under the new criteria. All faculty members appointed for the 2015-16 academic year and subsequent years shall be evaluated under the new criteria (see Section 612.5.2.g for more details).

Attached are copies of the signed cover sheet, the approved Department Personnel Procedures and Section 612.5.2.g. Please distribute the newly approved Procedures to all faculty along with a copy of Section 612.5.2.g. no later than 14 days after the first day of instruction of the academic term.

SG:ic

n:ppr-correspondance-_approval

cc: Tom Devine, Chair, Department Personnel Committee (w/o attachment)
Sabina Magliocco, Chair, College Personnel Committee
Stella Theodoulou, Dean, College of Social & Behavioral Sciences (w/o attachment)
William Whiting, Associate Vice President, Faculty Affairs (w/o attachment)

**COVER SHEET FOR PROPOSED CHANGES TO DEPARTMENT/COLLEGE
PERSONNEL PROCEDURES**

CS&BS

History

COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT

In order to facilitate a complete and expeditious review by the Personnel Planning and Review Committee (PP&R) of the change(s) you propose to your personnel procedures, please adhere to the format described below, and also fill out the Background Information. Attach this memo as a cover sheet for the written material you submit to PP&R. PP&R assumes that the initiating Department or College Committee has determined that the proposed new or revised procedures are consistent with Section 600 and with the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

FORMAT: *Please use a complete copy of your existing procedures as the starting point for the proposed revisions that you submit to PP&R for approval. Strike over any text that you wish to have deleted from your written procedures, and/or underline any text that you wish to have added to your written procedures.*

RECEIVED
CSUN

DEC 15 2014

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

- Are proposed changes those of College or Department procedures? (check one)
- Date that current proposed changes were sent forward November 10, 2014
- Department or College initiating proposed changes Department of History
- Describe briefly the general reason(s) for your proposed change(s) (e.g., "proposed changes were initiated by the Department in response to a request from the College Personnel Committee, which felt that existing promotion criteria were too rigorous"). _____

Office of
Faculty Affairs

In 2013-14 the History Department missed the deadline for the renewal of procedures.

PP&R refused to consider a late request in January, and told us to resubmit this year. These procedures add standards for "Contributions to the Field of Study" and apply the standards for class visits used for full time faculty to part time faculty.

- The proposed changes have been approved by the faculty of the College or Department . (check one)

FOR DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL PROCEDURES:

Thomas J. Devine 11/16/2014
Chair, Department Personnel Committee Date

[Signature] 11/10/2014
Department Chair Date

FOR DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL PROCEDURES & COLLEGE PERSONNEL PROCEDURES:

John Magliocco 12/10/2014
Chair, College Personnel Committee Date

[Signature] DEC 10 2014
College Dean Date

[Signature] _____
Chair, Personnel Planning and Review Committee Date

(for PP&R use only)		
<u>SP15</u>	<u>Fall 15</u>	<u>Fall 19</u>
Approval Date	Effective Date (see attached)	Date of Next Review

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
PERSONNEL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

I. The Department of History follows the criteria, policies, and procedures for retention, tenure, and promotion of full-time, tenure-track faculty set forth in Section 600 of the University's *Administrative Manual*. The Department has not adopted specific criteria or policies for personnel actions beyond those set forth in Sections 600. The only exception is a specific definition of Contributions to the Field of Study, as set forth below.

A. The History Department defines the category "Contributions to the Field of Study" as employed in Section 600, as follows: candidates for Tenure and Promotion to Associate or Full Professor will provide evidence of activity in both subcategories below:

1. Significant Scholarly and Creative Contributions to the Field of Study

Peer-reviewed scholarly books, book chapters, and articles that are published by recognized presses and journals (including e-journals) devoted to History or a closely-related field, or to pedagogical research and/or teacher education in History.

2. Other Contributions to the Field of Study

- a. Book reviews in recognized scholarly journals.
- b. Presentation of research at conferences organized by recognized scholarly organizations or universities and colleges.
- c. Development of public electronic resources to support historical research and archival preservation.
- d. Encyclopedia entries.
- e. Editing a scholarly journal.
- f. Holding an office in a scholarly organization.

The following procedures are followed in carrying out the requirements of Sections 600.

II. Procedures for Class Visits.

- A. For full-time, tenure-track faculty, Section 600 requires visits by both the Department Chair and the Department Personnel Committee, or their designees. Designees, whether of the Chair or the Committee, are tenured senior faculty from this Department.
- B. Required class visits are carried out according to the intervals specified in Sections 600, which allows additional visits if necessary.
- C. Visits during the Fall Semester take place during a six-week period in October and November. During the Spring Semester, the period is in March and April.
- D. Visits by the Department Chair are scheduled by mutual consent between the two individuals, taking into account, where possible, the faculty member's preferences for course and date of visitation.
- E. The Personnel Committee schedules its visits by announcing the period for visiting, soliciting from each individual faculty member the courses and dates available, and the preferences, if any, for course and date. The Committee does not entertain requests for a specific individual to be assigned. The Committee will arrange visits by mutual consent, including such factors as workload, availability, and where possible, requests as to course and date. As early as possible prior to the scheduled visit, and 5 days at a minimum, the Committee will inform both parties in writing of the details and provide explanatory information.
- F. Prior to all visits, the individual will be expected to provide the visitor, in a timely fashion before the visit, a current resume, a syllabus of the course in question, any handouts relevant to the particular session, sample examinations/assignments, and a statement of teaching philosophy. These items would logically be the same ones included in the individual's Professional Information File; however, the entire file should not be given to the visitor.
- G. During class, the visitor will be interested in the relation of the class session to the overall structure and purpose of the course; the clarity and organization of the lecture or other presentation; the instructor's receptiveness to student questions and the clarity of responses; encouragement and management of discussion, and the quality thereof; classroom management; the professionalism of the instructor (broadly defined); and other specific points as they may be relevant. The focus of the visitor's evaluation will be appropriate to the pedagogy employed in the class.
- H. Following the visit, the instructor and visitor will meet by mutual agreement to discuss the evaluation. This discussion will include the

points in Section G., and also the overall concept of the course, including the syllabus; the appropriateness of the course content and requirements to the instructional level; the appropriateness of sample examinations, with specific relation to Department requirements; and the ways in which the course reflects the instructor's stated teaching goals.

Following this meeting, and no more than 14 calendar days after the visit, the visitor will complete a written report as required by University regulations. The report will be in the form of a letter addressed to the individual, covering the points mentioned above, as well as an overall impression. If the instructor disagrees with any part of the written evaluation, within ten (10) calendar days, the instructor may request a meeting to discuss the report and/or prepare a written response for inclusion in the instructor's Personnel Action File. After the ten (10) calendar day period, copies of the report will be provided to the Department Chair and the Chair of the Personnel Committee. The Department Chair will ensure that copies of all reports are placed in the individuals' Personnel Action Files in the Dean's Office.

III. Procedures for Administering Student Evaluations of Teaching

The History Department administers student evaluations of teaching on the schedules provided in Sections 600, namely, in two classes each academic year for all faculty members. For faculty in their first year, at least two courses in both Fall and Spring semesters will be evaluated.

- A. The History Department has three approved evaluation instruments: the Quantitative Short Form and the Quantitative Long Form, both maintained by Instructional Technology; and the History Department Narrative Student Evaluation Questionnaire (reproduced below).
- B. Individual faculty members may choose any one of the three approved forms.

Each instructor may select the specific classes to be evaluated, which should be representative of his/her teaching areas. Candidates for personnel action should have questionnaires administered in the Fall semester. Other faculty may have questionnaires administered either in Fall or Spring. However, new faculty must have questionnaires administered in their first semester of employment.

Prior to administering the questionnaires, the instructor should read and follow the instructions provided with the evaluation forms. At the time of administration of the questionnaires, the instructor should select a student to read the instructions to the class, distribute the forms to the students, and then ensure that the forms are collected, placed in the envelope,

sealed, signed with the student's name, and delivered by the student to the History Department office. The instructor should not be present while the class is filling out the forms.

- C. In the case of the two Quantitative forms, processing for transmittal to Instructional Technology shall be performed only by the professional Department clerical staff. Student assistants shall never be permitted to handle any evaluation forms at any time.
- D. In the case of the Narrative forms, they shall remain sealed and be turned over to the Department Chair, whose responsibility it is to read them and prepare a summary, as shown on the form reproduced below.

Following the assignment of semester grades, the Department Chair will provide to each faculty member the results of his/her evaluations, and file the results in accordance with the requirements of Sections 600. Instructors who use Quantitative forms receive the results of their own evaluations together with a copy of the Department's overall Quantitative results.

IV. Procedures for Student Consultation

- A. Section 600 requires that the Department Personnel Committee provide students the opportunity to consult with the Committee regarding the teaching performance of probationary or tenured faculty members under consideration for RTP. These provisions do not affect the right of students to consult with the Department Chair on such issues.
- B. The History Department has adopted the following procedure in the attempt to preserve academic freedom and the integrity of the personnel process. The following announcement will be posted on the sixth floor of Sierra Tower and on other History Department bulletin boards:

“The Faculty of the History Department affirms the prerogative of students to consult the department regarding teaching performance, curriculum, and resources. Students wishing to avail themselves of this opportunity are advised to contact the Department Chair with their opinions on the teaching performance of faculty under personnel consideration and are advised that they may also consult with the Department Personnel Committee regarding those faculty. Students interested in participating in this process will be invited to meet with the Personnel Committee. For specific dates and times, consult the Department Secretary in Sierra Tower 614.”

- C. The Personnel Committee, in accordance with the relevant provisions of Section 600, shall determine the use and disposition of information provided by students during such consultation. As noted in Section 600, only signed, written statements may be used in the evaluation of the faculty member.

Attachment A: Student Evaluation Questionnaire, Narrative Form

STUDENT EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructor _____ Semester _____ Course _____

Freshman ____ Sophomore ____ Junior ____ Senior ____ Graduate ____

Please write a brief paragraph in response to each question. These answers will assist the professor in evaluating the quality of his or her teaching, and will also help the History Department to evaluate candidates for promotion. Please give full and frank reasons for your judgments.

Was the professor effective in conveying and analyzing information and understanding of the subject matter of the course? Please explain.

2. Did the professor encourage independent, creative thinking and the free expression of ideas in the classroom, and if so, how?

3. Did the professor present scholarly viewpoints different from his or her own?

With respect to examinations, projects, or other testing devices, how adequately did the professor relate them to the subject matter, explain his or her expectations beforehand, and return them with appropriate explanations as to the quality?

Were the course readings and other course material a valuable part of the course? Can you suggest other materials or types of materials which you think would be more valuable?

Did this course make a significant contribution to your general education? If so, how?

Did the professor evidence an interest in students by making himself or herself available for consultation concerning the course or problems of academic advisement?

The following two questions are intended to ask you to summarize your perceptions of this course and instructor. Please mark your answers on this sheet. Circle no. 1 if the statement is not at all descriptive of your perceptions, on up to no. 5 if the statement is very descriptive.

- | | <u>Least</u> | | | <u>Most</u> | |
|---|--------------|---|---|-------------|---|
| 1. The course increased my knowledge and understanding of the subject matter. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. The instructor is competent in his/her field and is an effective teacher. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

In addition to answering these questions, you may, if you wish, use this page to make any further suggestions for improving the course.

Attachment B: Summary Report For Narrative Questionnaires

To: [College Dean]

From: [Department Chair]

Subject: Student Evaluation Questionnaires

This past semester, [professor's name] used the History department's narrative questionnaire for student evaluation of his/her class(es). These questionnaires also include the following two quantifiable questions:

- | | <u>Least</u> | | <u>Most</u> | | |
|---|--------------|---|-------------|---|---|
| 1. The course increased my knowledge and understanding of the subject matter. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. The instructor is competent in his/her field and is an effective teacher. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

For the class(es) identified below, the professor's scores on the above quantifiable questions were as follows:

Course	No. of evaluations	Question 1	Question 2
_____	_____	_____	_____

Characteristic student comments in this course: