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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 with the exception of its modified 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 specified in Section 632.4, as follows, with the expectation that candidates for RTP will provide evidence of activity in both subcategories:

1. Primary Contributions

   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, or to public history research and exhibitions.

2. Secondary Contributions

   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.

B. Required class visits are carried out according to the intervals specified in Sections 600. Those sections allow additional visits if necessary.

C. Visits during the Fall Semester take place during a six-week period in October and November. During the Spring 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 the visit.

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.

I. Within 14 days of this meeting, the visitor will submit 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. Copies will be addressed 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.

J. If the instructor disagrees with any part of the written evaluation, he or she may prepare a written response for inclusion in his or her Personnel Action File.

K. Any instructor may, at any time and on his or her initiative, arrange a class visit by any faculty member of this university or any other university, and may ask that individual to prepare a report for inclusion in the Professional Information File. Such visit may not substitute for one by the Department Chair or the Personnel Committee.

III. Procedures for Administering Student Evaluations of Teaching

A. Per Section 612.5.2.c.(2)(b)(ii): All probationary faculty members shall have student evaluations administered in two classes in each of their first two semesters of service.

B. The History Department has four approved evaluation instruments: the Quantitative Short Form and the Quantitative Long Form, both maintained by Instructional Technology; the History Department Narrative Student Evaluation Questionnaire (reproduced below); and the SEFs.

C. Individual faculty members may choose any one of the four approved forms/methods.

D. Each instructor may select the specific classes to be evaluated, which should be representative of their 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.

E. When administering the papers questionnaires (ie, not SEFs), the instructor should read to the class the statement regarding the use of student questionnaires, which is supplied along with the forms. The instructor should select a student to 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 while the class is filling out the forms.

F. 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.

G. 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.

H. Following the assignment of semester grades, the Department Chair will provide to each faculty member the results of their 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.
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 their teaching, and will also help the History Department to evaluate candidates for promotion. Please give full and frank reasons for your judgments.

1. 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 their own?

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

5. 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?

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

7. Did the professor demonstrate an interest in students by making themselves 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Least</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Most</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The course increased my knowledge and understanding of the subject matter.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The instructor is competent in their field and is an effective teacher.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to answering these questions, you may, if you wish, use this page to make any further suggestions for improving the course.
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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Least</th>
<th>Most</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The course increased my knowledge and understanding of the subject matter.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The instructor is competent in their field and is an effective teacher.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>No. of evaluations</th>
<th>Question 1</th>
<th>Question 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Characteristic student comments in this course: