

**PROGRAM PERSONNEL STANDARDS**

**APPROVAL FORM**

**Discipline:**

**History**

Maureen Baker 5-7-19

Julia Baker 5-7-19

RTP Committee Chair Date

[Signature]

5-29-19

Provost Date

California State University Channel Islands

*History Program Personnel Standards*

**Introduction**

The educational quality of the History Program depends on the quality of its faculty who are responsible to develop and carry out the design and tasks of the curriculum. The energy, commitment, and attributes of the faculty determine the academic caliber and reputation of this program. Therefore, it is imperative for the program to set clear standards for its faculty to maintain a high quality program.

This document specifies the general principles, guidelines, and criteria for three purposes: (1) to establish the personnel performance standards to maintain a high quality faculty and program, (2) to guide individual faculty members to pursue a successful career, and (3) to assist the Program Personnel Committee (PPC), the program chair, the division and/or university Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Committee(s), and other appropriate offices in reviewing the professional growth and development of the history faculty.

The term “faculty” used in this document means tenure-track or tenured full-time instructional members of the History Program. The “portfolio” is the functional equivalent of the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF). For the “period of review” for tenure and promotion, see the current Senate RTP policy.

**The History Program Personnel Committee**

The History Program Personnel Committee (HPPC) shall be composed of three tenured members, who shall be elected annually by simple majority of the full-time tenure-track members of the history faculty as soon as possible in each fall semester.

If the History Program has fewer than three tenured members, a list of tenured faculty from across the university shall be generated by the full-time tenure-track members, who will then vote by simple majority for as many members as necessary to constitute the three-member HPPC. In cases of promotion, committee members’ rank must be higher than the one under review.

The HPPC shall have the responsibilities to review all portfolios on schedule and to provide written comments on each of the three areas of professional activity and to make a recommendation on retention, tenure and/or promotion. In addition, they may write a general summary of the overall performance of a faculty member.

**The Faculty Member**

The faculty member requesting retention, tenure, or promotion, shall have the responsibility to prepare all necessary documents on time, according to the requirements specified in the current

university RTP policy.

The faculty member shall have the right to submit a written response to the HPPC's in accordance with the CBA and University policy.

### **Program Statement on Equity and Inclusion**

The History Program affirms California State University Channel Islands commitment to equity and diversity as reflected by the multicultural and international mission pillars of the University as well as Academic Senate Resolution #SR 16-01.

History faculty members are responsible for helping to foster a collaborative and inclusive community that strives for equity and equal opportunity on our campus and beyond.

Given this commitment, the History Program encourages and values contributions to equity, inclusion, and diversity through teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and professional, university, and community service.

### **Personnel Standards**

#### **Teaching/Primary Responsibilities:**

Teaching is central to the mission of this student-centered university and is the primary responsibility of every faculty member.

Teaching involves both classroom instruction and many other activities facilitating that instruction, such as curriculum development, program development, assessment, scholarship of teaching and learning, IT application in the classroom, and innovations of pedagogies.

The faculty performance in the classroom is the most important aspect of the faculty teaching activity, and is primarily evaluated through (1) campus-wide student evaluations, (2) written reports of classroom visitations by peers, (3) the quality and variety of contributions to teaching.

#### (1) Campus-wide student evaluations

Courses shall be evaluated per CBA and campus policy. In the teaching narrative, the faculty member shall reflect on their student evaluations, including how they have used them to improve their teaching.

#### (2) Written reports of classroom visitations by peers

In accordance with campus policy, peer reviews shall occur at least one per year, as they can provide critical insight about the instructor's performance in the classroom.

#### (3) The quality and variety of contributions to teaching

A faculty member's willingness and ability to design, develop, and offer a variety of different courses is a strength in teaching, which is encouraged and appreciated. Active participation in program development, assessment, review, and innovation is also valued in teaching.

For a faculty member to be rated "Exceeds Standards of Achievement" there should be a record

of serious reflection and effort toward improvement and innovation (where appropriate), peer observations that affirm excellence in teaching, and teaching at least four different history courses on this campus.

For teaching, the following evidence shall be included:

Course syllabi,  
Course materials and handouts,

A faculty member's teaching will be assessed by evidence of the breadth, the variety, the creativity, and the interdisciplinarity of one's course offerings, as well as a pattern of consistencies, which can be documented in these activities:

New courses developed and taught at CI,  
Programmatic development at the program level,  
Programmatic development at the university level or across the disciplines,  
Program and curriculum assessment and reviews,  
Campus-wide learning activities,  
IT applications in teaching in the classroom, off campus, or on the internet,  
New and innovative pedagogies,  
Student learning outcome assessment,  
Student-centered learning,  
Student career success,  
Students' life-long learning.

**Scholarly and Creative Activities:**

Scholarship in the History Program is defined as original contributions to historical knowledge recognized by peers and disseminated to the profession/public.

Scholarly monographs based on original archival research and published by academic presses are the benchmark of scholarship in history.

Peer-reviewed scholarship as outlined in Categories 1 and 2 below is required for Tenure and Promotion. Peer-reviewed is defined as a publication judged by an impartial panel of experts in the field, but external to the campus. The review is done by reviewers other than the editor of the publication (i.e. the editor is not the sole reviewer of the submission). The following scholarship chart, based on a numerical distribution in five categories, provides a guide to evaluate the quality, quantity, variety, and continued promise of a faculty member's accomplishments in scholarship. This means that scholarly articles published by professional journals, history textbooks and anthologies, individual or joint contributions to academic publications, grants, fellowships, paper presentations at professional conferences, and online publications will be valued on a descending scale according to the significance of a particular work. In the narrative on scholarship, the faculty member should reflect on the reputation of the journals or presses publishing their scholarship. Scholarship of teaching is encouraged and shall be counted in the same way as other scholarly accomplishments in the chart.

For purposes of tenure and/or promotion from assistant professor to associate professor:

Fifteen (15) points "Meets Standards of Achievement," some component of which must come

from Category 1 and/or 2.

Twenty (20) “Exceeds Standards of Achievement,” some component of which must come from Category 1 and/or 2.

Twenty-five (25) “Significantly Exceeds Standards of Achievement,” some component of which must come from Category 1 and/or 2.

For promotion from associate professor to full professor:

Twenty (20) new points meets standards, some component of which should come from Category 1 and/or 2.

Twenty-five (25) exceeds, some component of which should come from Category 1 and/or 2.

Thirty (30) significantly exceeds, some component of which should come from Category 1 and/or 2.

### **Scholarship Chart**

#### Category 1 - Peer-Reviewed (No limits)

1-1

Single authored book/monograph published by an academic press of an international/national reputation: 16

1-2

Single authored book/monograph published by an academic press of a national/regional reputation: 14

1-3

Single authored book/monograph published by an academic press of a regional/field/subfield reputation: 12

Single authored textbook published by an academic press: 12

1-4

Single authored book/monograph published by a commercial press of reputation: 10

Single authored textbook published by non-academic press: 10

1-5

Single editor of one volume publication by an academic press: 8

Multiple editor of one volume publication by an academic press: 7

Co-authored textbook: 7

#### Category 2 - Peer-Reviewed (No limits)

2-1

Single authored article/chapter in peer-reviewed publication/journal of international/national reputation: 7

2-2

Single authored article/chapter in peer-reviewed publication/journal of national/regional reputation: 6

2-3

Single authored article/chapter in peer-reviewed publication/journal of regional/field/subfield reputation: 5

2-4

Co-authored article/chapter in peer-reviewed publication/journal of regional/field/subfield reputation: 4

Category 3 (Limited use to a maximum of 6 points)

3-1

Single authored article/chapter in a non-peer-reviewed publication/journal: 2

3-2

Single authored on-line article/chapter: 2

Book review in peer-reviewed publications/journals: 2

3-3

Singled authored piece in newspapers or other media: 1

Book review in non-peer-reviewed publications: 1

3-4

Co-authored article/chapter in a non-peer-reviewed publication/journal

Any edited volume by a non-academic press: 4

Category 4 (Limited use to a maximum of 7 points)

4-1

Paper presentation and/or abstracts at national/international conferences: 3

4-2

Paper presentation and/or abstracts at regional/local conferences: 2

Category 5 (Limited use up to a maximum of 3 points)

5-1

Long-term (four months or more) grant/scholarship/fellowship: 3

5-2

Short-term (less than four months) grant/scholarship/fellowship awarded: 2

Grant/funding awarded by CSUCI to support one's scholarly/creative activity: 2

5-3

Non-funded grant proposal to support one's scholarly/creative activity: 1

Category 6 (Limited use up to a maximum of 3 points)

6-1

Post on an academic Blog, edited by academics: 2

6-2

Book Review for a web-based academic journal or venue, edited by academics: 2

6-3

Curating a digital archive: 1-3 (depending on size and scope of the faculty member's contribution)

Presenting research using digital humanities venues and/or software: 1

6-4

Podcast focused on one's scholarship: 1

Evidence shall be presented to validate claims for credit points. It is strongly suggested that a faculty member submit all publication samples as direct evidence. The terminology used in describing and categorizing one's work should be:

- in progress (actively working on it),
- under review (by a journal or press),
- accepted (by a journal or press after all necessary in-house and external reviews of a complete manuscript),
- in print (accepted and at some stage in the process of being copyedited and typeset),
- published (out in print).

Only a work that has been accepted for publication, is in print, or has been published shall be counted as an item of publication, which shall then receive appropriate points from the above chart. For articles, a formal letter of acceptance is needed as evidence. For books (including monographs, textbooks, edited volumes, or anthologies), an explicit promise (such as a signed contract) to publish from the editor/publisher is required as evidence.

All works in progress or under various stages of review(s), including any book proposal(s) or pre-contract given to any anticipated future work, shall not be counted as "publication(s)" in calculating the points. They can be viewed as part of the faculty member's on-going activity.

No artistic work or publications of fiction, poetry, plays, dramas, music, or paintings shall be counted as scholarship, unless the faculty member is hired as a historian of arts, music, or literature.

**Professional, University, and Community Service:**

Faculty service activities include services performed for the Program/Department, the Division of Academic Affairs, the Academic Senate, campus divisions, student organizations, the university, the CSU system, and professional organizations at local/regional/national/international levels.

History believes that assistant professors should focus their initial years on teaching and scholarly activity, while building a portfolio of service over time. The quality of a faculty member's service should include but not limit to these activities and characteristics: leadership or participation roles,

the degree of initiation or consistency of commitment to a task or tasks, different levels and a variety of ranges of services, positive feedback from colleagues and community, and tangible products or concrete accomplishments.

Participation in the following eight categories will be counted as service activity (note: these are not ranked in any order or hierarchy, but it is expected that some service will be from Categories 1-5):

- (1) Academic program/department assignments, work projects, governance or offices, committee or subcommittees,
- (2) Campus division assignments, work projects, task forces, governance or offices, committees or subcommittees,
- (3) Faculty Senate assignments, work projects, governance or offices, committees or subcommittees,
- (4) University or CSU system wide assignments, work projects, task forces, governance or offices, committees or subcommittees,
- (5) Participation or advisory roles in student organizations,
- (6) Community initiatives/organizations, work projects, task forces, offices, committees or subcommittees,
- (7) Service to the profession, such as official, service, and/or consulting positions in professional organizations at local/regional/national/international levels; serving as a manuscript reviewer for journals/ presses.
- (8) Editorship of an academic journal

Participation in activities of at least THREE categories each year is required to be rated as “Meets Standards of Achievement.” Playing a leadership role in one capacity in any of the three categories or participation in activities of FOUR and more categories each year will be rated as “Exceeds Standards of Achievement.”

### **Provisos**

The University RTP document supersedes the History Program Personnel Standards wherever any discrepancy occurs between the two documents.

The History Program Personnel Standards shall be reviewed and updated at intervals not greater than five years if not sooner in responding to any related changes of the division/university RTP procedures. The History Program Personnel Committee and the Chair of the History Program shall review the HPPS and propose any change jointly. A simple majority vote of program faculty approves the changes. The chair shall then submit the up-dated HPPS to the university RTP committee for approval. The revised HPPS will take effect after the approvals by the university RTP committee and by the Provost/VPAA.

History Program Personnel Standards (original)

September 22, 2005: Passed at the History Program Meeting.

October 24, 2005: Revised According to the RTP Committee’s Suggestions.

October 25, 2005: Approved by the RTP Committee.

January 23, 2006: Approved by Ashish Vaidya, Interim Dean of the Faculty.  
June 23, 2006: Approved by Theodore D. Lucas, Provost and Vice President.

Spring 2011: Draft revisions

Fall 2011: Passed at the History Program Meeting on October 12, 2011.

Spring '18 - Fall '19: Draft Revisions

Fall 2019: Passed by unanimous support of History TT Faculty on March 4, 2019.