

Department of History
College of Letters, Arts and Sciences

May 31, 2009

Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Criteria
Department of History – College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences

February 20, 2009

Approved by the Provost: May 28, 2009

Introduction:

Standards and processes for reappointment, promotion and tenure of faculty are governed by Article V and Appendix A of the Laws of the Regents. These are further delineated in a series of CU Administrative Policy Statements. Campus guidance is supplied in UCCS Policy # 200-001. These documents require the establishment of departmental criteria which are to be used throughout the review process.

These criteria are to be considered guidelines for the general review of candidates toward reappointment, promotion and tenure in the Department of History at the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs. The criteria are based on appropriate and current standards of professional performance in our discipline. Each candidate's case will be reviewed and judged on its individual merits and circumstances. The department is committed to quality teaching, strong research/creative work, and effective service to the university, the profession, and the community. The evaluation process assumes: possession of an appropriate terminal degree; competent education and training in the discipline(s); conduct which reflects the professional and academic standards for generating, validating, disputing, and transmitting knowledge; and an appreciation of and respect for the rights, duties, and privileges associated with academic freedom and collegial responsibilities. We do not use a Faculty Responsibility Statement in our reappointment, promotion and tenure process.

When these criteria are applied to faculty who were granted time toward tenure, the years granted toward tenure shall be considered equivalent to work performed at UCCS. While a faculty member's career record will be considered in personnel actions described here, the main emphasis of evaluation will be on work performed at UCCS and, in particular, progress since the last review.

Initial Review:

The candidate's total record, including teaching, research and service, shall be evaluated. No specific rating in each area is required, but the record must show sufficient potential of future success to justify reappointment.

Teaching: The candidate's teaching shall be evaluated by multiple means which will include, at a minimum, Faculty Course Questionnaires (FCQs) and two other means of evaluation. See the appendix to this document for examples of other means. In addition to classroom teaching, the candidate's work with students outside of the classroom as a mentor, research advisor, independent study director, or in similar roles shall be considered here. The candidate is expected to show potential for continued development

as a teacher. Candidates should demonstrate that their courses are coherently organized and thoughtfully presented and that they deal with significant historical problems. Furthermore, candidates will be expected to demonstrate a commitment to teaching, evidence of which will be good interaction with students, concern with curriculum, and satisfactory development of skills in presenting material. Improvement and innovations in teaching methods and in curriculum development and contribution to the department will be taken into consideration.

Research and Creative Work: The department recognizes that scholarship can take many forms. Our department emphasizes fundamental research leading to new perspectives, as well as scholarly work which integrates existing knowledge. The department supports and encourages traditional academic publication through peer-reviewed venues, but we also recognize and value other forms of scholarly work. We recognize scholarly study of teaching and learning issues in our field as a form of research. We recognize the validity of an application of historical knowledge in the academic or wider community, for example, through scholarly work that supports a public exhibit on an historical topic. We recognize, too, that historical understanding can be conveyed through creative art. Whatever the form of scholarship, evaluation will be based on the degree of scholarly rigor. In case of co-authored or collaborative work, the candidate is expected to supply an account of his/her role. See the appendix of this document for a list of decisive and contributing factors in evaluation.

For the initial review, the candidate is expected to demonstrate a well-designed research plan and the potential for continued development as a researcher and progress toward publication. This might include drafts of work in progress, presentations at professional meetings, and/or articles submitted for publication.

Service: The department recognizes service to the campus, community and our profession. At this stage, the candidate is expected to be involved in departmental meetings and activities. See the appendix of this document for a list of forms of service.

Comprehensive Review:

The candidate's record in teaching, research, and service will each be evaluated separately as either below expectations, meritorious, or excellent. The candidate must demonstrate sufficient progress toward tenure to justify reappointment. This will typically be a rating of at least meritorious in all three areas. The review may also take into account issues of material bearing such as strategic goals of the department, college and campus.

Teaching: The candidate will be expected to demonstrate effective teaching evaluated by multiple means which will include, at a minimum, Faculty Course Questionnaires and two other means of evaluation. Examples of other means of evaluation are provided in the appendix to this document. This evaluation includes contributions to the breadth, depth, and needs of the department through expansion of curriculum. In addition to classroom teaching, the candidate's work with students outside of the classroom as a

mentor, research advisor, independent study director, and in similar roles shall be considered here. A rating of meritorious will refer for support to student evaluations and to other evidence of effective teaching. A rating of excellent will require clear evidence from FCQs and/or other evaluative means. A rating of meritorious is also to be regarded as a positive judgment, reached when the preponderance of these various indicators suggests somewhat less success than for the excellent rating. Important as student evaluations are, they will be used in context of such factors as class size and course level or rigor. The candidate's overall dedication to student learning must also be evident.

Research: The department recognizes that scholarship can take many forms. Our department emphasizes fundamental research leading to new perspectives, as well as scholarly work which integrates existing knowledge. The department supports and encourages traditional academic publication through peer-reviewed venues, but we also recognize and value other forms of scholarly work. We recognize scholarly study of teaching and learning issues in our field as a form of research. We recognize the validity of an application of historical knowledge in the academic or wider community, for example, through scholarly work that supports a public exhibit on an historical topic. We recognize, too, that historical understanding can be conveyed through creative art. Whatever the form of scholarship, evaluation will be based on the degree of scholarly rigor. In case of co-authored or collaborative work, the candidate is expected to supply an account of his/her role. See the appendix of this document for a list of decisive and contributing factors in evaluation.

For the comprehensive review, a rating of meritorious requires reasonable progress toward tenure as demonstrated by submission of research proposals, professional presentations, publications, and by outside letters of evaluation of the candidate's work. A rating of excellent will also refer to outside letters for support and requires at least three publications, which may include refereed journal articles, refereed book chapters, refereed scholarly editorial or translating work, or other equivalent scholarly work. Receipt of peer-reviewed grants or contracts that lead to publishable results may be substituted for these smaller publications, as may, where suitably rigorous, forms of applied historical knowledge or creative art. A single larger publication, such as a refereed book in print or accepted for print, can itself be sufficient for a rating of excellent. Exceptional quality of scholarly work may be considered to raise an evaluation in cases where the quantity specified has not been met.

Service: The department recognizes service to the campus, community and to our profession. A rating of meritorious requires meeting service responsibilities within the department and some service to the college, campus, community or profession. A rating of excellent requires meeting service responsibilities within the department and multiple service contributions to the college, campus, community, or profession. In evaluating service both the quality and quantity of service contributions will be considered. See the appendix of this document for a list of forms of service.

Promotion to Associate Professor and Awarding of Tenure:

The candidate's record in teaching, research, and service will each be evaluated separately as below expectations, meritorious, or excellent. The candidate must be rated as, at least, meritorious in all three areas and must receive a rating of excellent in either teaching or research.

Teaching: The candidate will be expected to demonstrate effective teaching evaluated by multiple means which will include, at a minimum, Faculty Course Questionnaires and two other means of evaluation. Examples of other means of evaluation are provided in the appendix to this document. This evaluation includes contributions to the breadth, depth, and needs of the department and updating curriculum and course materials. In addition to classroom teaching, the candidate's work with students outside of the classroom as a mentor, research advisor, independent study director, or in similar roles shall be considered here. A rating of meritorious will refer for support to student evaluations and to other evidence of effective teaching. A rating of excellent will require clear evidence from FCQs and/or other evaluative means. A rating of meritorious is also to be regarded as a positive judgment, reached because the preponderance of these various indicators suggests somewhat less success than for the excellent rating. Important as student evaluations are, they will be used in context of such factors as class size and course level or rigor. The candidate's overall dedication to student learning must also be evident.

Research: The department recognizes that scholarship can take many forms. Our department emphasizes fundamental research leading to new perspectives, as well as scholarly work which integrates existing knowledge. The department supports and encourages traditional academic publication through peer-reviewed venues, but we also recognize and value other forms of scholarly work. We recognize scholarly study of teaching and learning issues in our field as a form of research. We recognize the validity of an application of historical knowledge in the academic or wider community, for example, through scholarly work that supports a public exhibit on an historical topic. We recognize, too, that historical understanding can be conveyed through creative art. Whatever the form of scholarship, evaluation will be based on the degree of scholarly rigor. In case of co-authored or collaborative work, the candidate is expected to supply an account of his/her role. See the appendix of this document for a list of decisive or contributing factors in evaluation.

For promotion to associate professor and tenure, a rating of meritorious requires at least three peer-reviewed publications which make an original scholarly contribution published or accepted in final form. These may include refereed journal articles, refereed book chapters, refereed editorial or translating work, or other equivalent scholarly work. Receipt of peer-reviewed grants or contracts may be substituted for these smaller publications, as may, where suitably rigorous, forms of applied knowledge or creative art. A rating of meritorious will refer to outside letters of evaluation for support, as will a rating of excellent. The latter requires at least five peer-reviewed publications which make an original scholarly contribution published or accepted in final form. These may

include refereed journal articles, refereed book chapters, refereed editorial or translating work, or other equivalent scholarly work. Receipt of peer-reviewed grants or contracts that lead to publishable results may be substituted for these smaller publications, as may, where suitably rigorous, forms of applied knowledge or creative art. A single larger publication, such as a refereed book in print or accepted for print, can itself be sufficient for a rating of excellent. Exceptional quality of scholarly work may be considered to raise an evaluation in cases where the quantity specified has not been met. Presentations at professional meetings, textbooks, and non-refereed publications may be considered on their scholarly merit as secondary evidence of ongoing research activity.

Service: The department recognizes service to the campus, community and to our profession. A rating of meritorious requires meeting service responsibilities within the department and service to the college, campus, community or profession. A rating of excellent requires meeting service responsibilities within the department and multiple service contributions to the college, campus, community, or profession. In evaluating service both the quality and quantity of service contributions will be considered. See the appendix of this document for a list of forms of service.

Promotion to Full Professor:

The candidate's record in teaching, research, and service will be evaluated as a whole as below expectations, meritorious, or excellent. Promotion requires "a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent; a record of significant contribution to both graduate and undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances require a stronger emphasis or singular focus on one or the other; and a record, since receiving tenure and promotion to associate professor, that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching and working with students, research, scholarship or creative work, and service."

Teaching: The candidate will be expected to demonstrate effective teaching evaluated by multiple means which will include, at a minimum, Faculty Course Questionnaires and two other means of evaluation. Examples of other means of evaluation are provided in the appendix to this document. This evaluation includes contributions to the breadth, depth, and needs of the department and updating curriculum and course materials. In addition to classroom teaching, the candidate's work with students outside of the classroom as a mentor, research advisor, independent study director, or in similar roles shall be considered here. The distinction drawn in prior sections of this document between 'excellent' and 'meritorious' teaching apply at this stage as well. Important as student evaluations are, they will be used in context of such factors as class size and course level or rigor. Substantial, significant and continued growth, development, and accomplishment as a teacher since tenure must be demonstrated through development of new and revised curriculum, new pedagogical techniques, participation in professional development, work with students outside the classroom and/or other aspects of teaching such as those in the appendix.

Research: The department recognizes that scholarship can take many forms. Our department emphasizes fundamental research leading to new perspectives, as well as scholarly work which integrates existing knowledge. The department supports and encourages traditional academic publication through peer-reviewed venues, but we also recognize and value other forms of scholarly work. We recognize scholarly study of teaching and learning issues in our field as a form of research. We recognize the validity of an application of historical knowledge in the academic or wider community, for example, through scholarly work that supports a public exhibit on an historical topic. We recognize, too, that historical understanding can be conveyed through creative art. Whatever the form of scholarship, evaluation will be based on the degree of scholarly rigor. In case of co-authored or collaborative work, the candidate is expected to supply an account of his/her role. See the appendix of this document for a list of decisive and contributing factors in evaluation.

For promotion to full professor, substantial, significant and continued growth, development, and accomplishment as a researcher since tenure must be demonstrated through refereed publications, peer-reviewed grants and other aspects of research such as those in the appendix. Exceptional quality of scholarly work may be considered to raise an evaluation in cases where the quantity is less. Presentations at professional meetings, textbooks and non-refereed publications may be considered as secondary evidence of ongoing research activity.

Service: The department recognizes service to the campus, community and to our profession. In evaluating service both the quality and quantity of service contributions will be considered. Substantial, significant and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in service since tenure must be demonstrated through a discussion of service progress in the department, college, campus, university, community and in our profession. We recognize that different faculty at this level will fulfill this requirement very differently. See the appendix of this document for a list of forms of service.

Post-tenure Review:

Recognizing the many different ways in which post-tenure faculty contribute to the University, we define “meeting expectations” for purposes of post-tenure review as consisting of three elements, each of which must be met: 1) having achieved a rating of “meeting expectations” or higher on each of the annual merit reviews included in the time period under review, 2) having met the goals of the faculty member’s current professional plan, and 3) having submitted an acceptable professional plan which indicates an ability to achieve “meeting expectations” or higher ratings in the future. If a faculty member is deficient in meeting this standard, the committee shall consider the total record of the faculty member during the review period to determine whether strengths in some time periods or some activities compensate for the deficiency such that a rating of “meeting expectations” is still appropriate. Ratings of “exceeding expectations” or “outstanding” will be awarded for exceeding these standards.

Appendix:

Examples of Appropriate Criteria for Faculty Evaluation

A. TEACHING IN ADDITION TO FCQs

1. Student Evaluation of Teaching on Forms Designed in Regard to Specific Course Content/ Pedagogy, or Unsolicited Reviews from Students
2. Teaching Awards and Other Outstanding Accomplishments in Instruction
3. Peer Evaluation of Teaching
4. Alumni Evaluation
5. Quality of Doctoral Dissertation and Master's Thesis Supervision and Graduate Committee Contributions
6. Student Advising
7. Innovations in Teaching
8. Creativity in Teaching
9. Effectiveness of Students in Subsequent Courses and/or in the Pursuit of Graduate Education and/or in Careers
10. Student Supervision in Professional Experience Activities and/or Independent Studies
11. Evaluation of Student Performance in Departmental Examinations and Assessments
12. Preparation of Course Material
13. Student Development (Centers of Excellence, Library Knowledge, Learning Disability Recognition, Encouragement of Students)
14. Course Organization
15. New Course Development
16. Teaching Improvement Activity (Workshops, Conferences)
17. Teaching Contribution at Any Institution in Addition to the University of Colorado
18. Risk Factor Involved in Teaching
19. Contributions of Teaching to Diversity

B. RESEARCH

Decisive Factors--

1. Peer-Judged Publications
2. Work Supporting Public Exhibits
3. Grants and Contracts (Sponsored Research)
4. Creative Art

Contributing Factors—

1. Papers Prepared for Professional Conferences, Workshops
2. Recognition by other Scholars of Research and Publications
3. Un-sponsored Research
4. Professional Reputation (Both Inside and Outside University)
5. Participation in Development Workshops
6. Participation in Career Development Activity (Workshops, Conference, Summer Schools, etc)

7. Long-Term Research Projects
8. Expert and Technical Consultation of Research Projects
9. Reviewing Research Proposals
10. Reviewing Books in Scholarly Journals
11. Reviewing Grant Proposals
12. Refereeing Manuscripts
13. Risk/Difficulty Factor in Any of the Above
14. Contribution to Diversity in Any of the Above

C. SERVICE

1. Departmental, College, Campus and University Committees
2. Administrative Service (such as program director, chair, center director ...)
3. Service to the Profession and Discipline (Local, State, National, International Level)
4. Consultation and Public Service
5. Role Modeling and Mentoring of Teaching, Research or Service on Any Educational Level
6. Participation at Professional Conferences, Specifically Organizational Activities (Local Planning Committees, Site Visit Details, Activities Involved in Local, Regional and National Meetings, etc.)
7. Membership In and/or Office-holding in Professional Associations.
8. Service Contribution to Education at Any Level and at Any Institution in Addition to the University of Colorado
9. Contribution to Diversity
10. Participation in Faculty Governance