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PERSONNEL POLICIES IN THE HISTORY DEPARTMENT

I. INTRODUCTION

A. The History Department acknowledges that the evaluation of faculty members eligible for reappointment, promotion, and tenure is an exceedingly important responsibility of any academic community. The same can be said for initial appointment recommendations as well as the periodic evaluation of tenured faculty. Evaluations must and should be made, not only to assure that the primary objectives of the educational institution are being met, but also to assist those evaluated in strengthening their general performance within the educational institution. Recognition and implementation of this responsibility, however, does not make the setting of criteria or the process of evaluation an easy task. Despite the difficulties inherent in evaluation, it is incumbent upon department faculty to formulate criteria and procedures by which evaluation can be made. The purpose of this statement is to identify those criteria and procedures. It will also serve as a source of information to those who are subject to its application and to those appropriate administrative authorities who must act on the recommendations of the faculty.

B. As a means of encouraging professional growth and clarifying personnel policies and procedures, each faculty member applying for reappointment, tenure, or promotion will be given a copy of this statement along with the Faculty Evaluation Form. Concerned parties should also acquaint themselves with the current College of Liberal Arts Policies and Procedures and the relevant sections of the current Collective Bargaining Agreement between the CSU Board of Trustees and the California Faculty Association.

C. During the first year of employment in a tenure-track position, new faculty members should work with their departmental colleagues to formulate a professional development plan to make a contribution to the discipline based on scholarship and to keep their teaching current and dynamic.

II. CONSTITUENCY OF PEER REVIEW COMMITTEE SELECTION

A. Early in Fall Quarter of each year, tenured and probationary faculty will elect a tenured full-time professor to serve on the College Promotions Committee. All tenured and probationary faculty will then elect the eligible tenured faculty as the department’s Peer Review Committee, as well as elect the chair.

B. The entire Peer Review Committee will vote on performance reviews relative to reappointment and tenure decisions. Only tenured associate and full professors in the body will vote on promotions to the associate professor rank. Only tenured full professors will vote on promotion to full professor rank. As per section 15.42 of the
2012-14 CBA, “Faculty unit employees being considered for promotion are ineligible for service on promotion or tenure peer review committees.”

C. All persons serving on college- or university-level personnel committees will be excluded from participating in promotion decisions at the department level.

III. ELABORATION FOR THE SELECTION AND WEIGHING OF PERSONNEL CRITERIA

A. Teaching Performance: Primary emphasis should be placed on teaching performance and the serving of student academic needs, both inside and outside the classroom.

General Statement on the Evaluation of Teaching

Definition of what constitutes excellent teaching is difficult to agree upon. One person may argue that the lecturer who is well organized, interesting, and witty is an excellent teacher; to which someone else replies that a discussion leader, who is self-effacing, is a far better teacher. They may both be right or wrong. The nature of the discipline, level of the course, type of student, and personalities of both the students and teachers will measurably affect the teaching situation. Assuming that agreement can be reached on various models of excellent teaching, the problem of measuring still remains.

One solution to the measurement problem often advanced is using student opinion. Questions that immediately arise include: Do students tend to appreciate “acting talent” more than competence? Can students, by the very nature of their apprenticeship status, adequately judge teaching competence? Do students tend to confuse judgment of teaching competence with criticism of course content? Does perceived student competence to judge courses vary with the level of the course? Are the evaluations of students in required general education courses to be equated with those of students in electing to take upper division courses in their major? Could students’ preconceived political and social prejudices impact evaluation of courses using unfamiliar and “controversial” arguments? Even if agreement can be reached on the validity of using student opinion in measuring excellent teaching, the means of soliciting that opinion poses still further problems.

Soliciting of student opinion often takes the form of informal talks with selected or self-appointed students. The validity of such information is open to considerable question. The unhappy student is too often the least competent judge. We should not act on the assumption that an instructor is an unwilling employee who must be watched. The use of student questionnaires is often advanced, but here the design of the questionnaires, the type of sample, and the usual problems of validity and reliability are raised. Students sometimes publish “course guides,” which frequently confuse evaluation of the professor with the content of the course and which raise the question of the propriety of using such publications in the evaluation process. Despite these problems, most professionals
are agreed that student evaluation of the faculty is an important procedure that cannot be overlooked.

Classroom visitation by appropriate faculty is also often advanced as a means of evaluating teaching performance. Problems that arise here include that announced visitations may provide a false picture, while unannounced visitations may not do the person justice--everyone is entitled to some bad days! There is also the subtle problem that the visitor may believe in unstructured discussion. Can one judge the other objectively?

There are, no doubt, many more problems that evaluating excellent teaching poses, but the above commentary gives some of the flavor of the problems to which the members of the History Department must address themselves.

Whereas, there is no universally accepted yardstick for measuring teaching effectiveness or competence, the History Department uses both student evaluation of faculty as well as colleague visitation of the classroom as two criteria by which teaching competence can be partially measured. However, while the tenured faculty and department chair will consider student evaluations and class visitations in any personnel decision, i.e. retention, tenure, and promotion, the specific weight given to these items will still remain at the discretion of those making recommendations and assessed as a part of the total criteria to be judged.

B. Possession of the doctorate, other appropriate terminal degree or equivalent: A faculty member may be initially appointed without an earned doctorate in History, but no instructor shall be considered for tenure or for promotion without the earned doctorate or equivalent. It is the responsibility of the tenured members to define what constitutes “equivalent” in any particular case, but ordinarily this would refer to some uniquely qualified person whose qualifications are readily apparent. The use of “equivalent” means that we do not want to preclude the appointment of one of the highly gifted and published historians who does not have a Ph.D. in History. It is the intention of the History Department to implement the provisions of Title 5 of the California Administrative Code. The appropriate portion is quoted as follows:

42711. Faculty. The faculty of each campus shall consist of specialists qualified to give the instruction in each authorized curriculum. The doctorate or equivalent attainment shall be the desirable qualification for appointment to a campus faculty position.

C. Contributions to the department, college, and to the university: Involvement in and contributions to the department, college, and the university benefits the university as a whole and provides an opportunity for faculty members to become fully acquainted with the institutional framework within which they teach. Excellence in service includes a leading role in the department, college or university. Other forms of service include effective and sustained contributions to important department, college, and university committees, Academic Senate service, leadership in the faculty union, assessment and
review functions, university programs and initiative, task forces, student clubs or groups, and advising/mentoring.

D. Research and creative activity related to teaching and the profession: Excellent research and creative activity will be in the form of: refereed books and articles and contributions to edited collections. Other forms of research and creative activities that the department encourages and recognizes include service as an editor, or on a board of editors, presentations and papers, reviewing manuscripts for press, consulting for the media, reviewing grants, conference organizing, holding office in a professional organization, developing new approaches to courses, and making scholarly documentaries. Most professionals agree that excellence in teaching cannot be maintained unless some research is included as an integral part of the teaching process. Research activity for the improvement of course content should be encouraged and expected.

Whereas the College of Liberal Arts Policies & Procedures (October 2013 ed.) state that “A positive recommendation for promotion to associate professor shall require evidence of scholarship equivalent to at least two articles published in well-respected and rigorously peer-reviewed scholarly journals in the relevant area” (8.E.2.b.2.c.iv.a), the History Department will consider the following forms of scholarship, subject to approval by the CLA Peer Review Committee, in determining whether a candidate has met the equivalent of CLA research requirements:

- □ a refereed book published by or in press (per CLA policy) with a well-respected press (a book of this type more than satisfies the two-article requirement)
- □ a refereed book chapter in an edited collection published or in press (per CLA policy) with a well-respected press
- □ a refereed article which is co-authored with one or two additional authors that is published or press (per CLA policy) in a well-respected journal
- □ a refereed book chapter which is co-authored with one or two additional authors in an edited collection published or in press (per CLA policy) with a well-respected press
- □ serving as named editor of a collection containing chapters from multiple authors published or in press (per CLA policy) with a well-respected press
- □ a scholarly documentary film, when evidence of a substantial role in writing, directing, or producing the documentary film is established and the quality of the documentary film is high

This list is not exhaustive. The department encourages tenure-track faculty members to consult with colleagues on the Peer Review Committee about their research and to include a thorough Professional Development Plan with each yearly Working Personnel Action File, especially if they are engaged in forms of historical scholarship not covered by this list.

E. Community service may include, but is not limited to the following: advising or consulting for public agencies, bureaus, commissions, legislative bodies, private agencies and organizations; conducting non-credit workshops; holding professionally-related
community positions, e.g. school board, education groups, professional advisory groups, historical societies, and archives; serving on accreditation visitations and other external evaluation teams; developing and carrying out grant-related activities (that involve direct service to the community); giving professionally-related presentations, talks, and seminars to community groups.

F. Guidelines for Evaluation during the Probationary Period: Candidates must demonstrate suitable progress toward fulfilling the requirements for tenure and promotion throughout the probationary period. The Peer Review Committee and the Department Chair are responsible for identifying areas of strength and for recommending actions candidates must take to fulfill any under- or un-met requirements. Rather than set quantitative minimums of attainment, the department will evaluate in a holistic manner the quality, scope, contribution, and importance of achievements in the areas of teaching, service, and research and creative activity.

Notwithstanding any other provision in these criteria and procedures for personnel actions, if the contract entered into pursuant to the California Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act is in conflict with any provision in this document, the terms of the contract and not the provisions of these procedures and criteria shall govern.

IV. SELECTION OF DEPARTMENT CHAIR

A. Method of Appointment:

1. Department chairs are appointed to three-year renewable terms. Department chairs may serve up to two consecutive terms. If there are no other candidates for the position, the department chair may serve beyond two consecutive terms if s/he receives the approval of a simple majority of the faculty.

2. Department chairs shall normally be selected from a list of tenured and/or probationary faculty members recommended to the dean by the departmental faculty (MOU 20.30).

   a. It is highly desirable that department chairs be tenured members of the faculty, preferably at the rank of professor.

   b. An untenured assistant professor would be considered for department chair only under extraordinary circumstances.

   c. The name(s) of the recommended candidate(s) will be generated using the internal or external search process described below in Section IV.B.

3. Internal searches are the preferred method for selecting new department chairs.
B. Department Policies on Internal Searches for Department Chair:

1. An open call for nominations from all tenured and probationary faculty members will be sent out by the current department chair, preferably in early fall quarter of the election year.

2. Candidates shall submit to the department faculty by early winter quarter a statement of their qualifications to serve as department chair.

3. A candidate forum will be held, with each candidate to have equal time and format for a presentation and questions. Candidates should make their presentations on the same day, and should not attend the other presentation(s).

4. Following a department meeting to discuss the qualifications of candidates, all eligible faculty (with eligibility defined by current CLA personnel policy) will cast their confidential vote to select the new department chair. The candidates shall not be present, or cast a vote, during the process. Faculty who are eligible to vote but away from the campus due to emergency situations, sabbaticals or other approved leaves of absence shall have the option of voting via a designated proxy.

5. If the department faculty cannot reach consensus on a single candidate, a list of qualified candidates with at least one-third of the total votes and ranked by the department faculty shall be sent to the Dean’s Office for recommendation to the provost before the end of the winter quarter.

6. If necessary, the department shall invite the dean to a department meeting to discuss the qualifications of the candidates before the dean makes a recommendation to the provost. The candidates shall not participate in this meeting.

7. External searches for chairs are very rare and driven by unusual circumstances in the department. The dean must approve an external search prior to its initiation.

   a. If a national search is approved, the search committee shall be recommended by the faculty and approved by the dean. Composition of the core of the search committee will conform to university, college, and department policies. Because the department chair will advise the dean and contribute to the leadership of the college and university in addition to leading the department, and because multiple perspectives will be useful in evaluating external candidates largely unknown to us, the core search committee will be augmented with a chair from another department, selected by History Department faculty, and an associate dean (ex officio member), recommended by the dean and approved by History Department faculty.

   b. The search committee shall make a recommendation to the department faculty, who will vote and comment on that recommendation.
c. The search committee’s recommendation and the faculty vote and comments shall be submitted to the dean.

d. If necessary, the dean will consult further with the search committee and the faculty before making a recommendation to the provost.

8. Interim department chair appointments for one-year terms may be made by the dean in consultation with department faculty.

C. Responsibilities and Qualifications:

1. The department chair is the department’s representative at college and university levels working in the framework of shared governance as acknowledged by the California Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA). The department chair is also the main administrative faculty member and a key member of the college’s leadership team.

   a. It is essential that the department chair provide effective communication, in both directions, between the department and the college.

   b. The department chair must have the ability to effectively represent his/her department to different constituencies and to collaborate with colleagues around the college and university, and the capacity to lead the department in contributing to the formulation and attainment of college and university priorities and goals.

   c. In addition to a commitment to the teacher-scholar model, an ideal department chair candidate would have demonstrable knowledge of and significant experience with:

      □ academic advising
      □ curriculum
      □ assessment
      □ peer review
      □ employment equity practices
      □ department, college, and university committees and policies
      □ collective bargaining agreements and shared governance rules and procedures
      □ advancement and outreach

---

1 The California Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA) Article 1, 3561(b), states: “The Legislature recognizes that joint decision-making and consultation between administration and faculty or academic employees is the long-accepted manner of governing institutions of higher learning and is essential to the performance of the educational missions of these institutions, and declares that it is the purpose of this act to both preserve and encourage that process.”
The subject document, approved by the History Department faculty in February 2014, is approved for immediate implementation. Please provide the History Department faculty access to the document as soon as possible.