

**Department of History**

**College of Letters, Arts and Sciences  
University of Colorado Colorado Springs**

**Criteria, Standards and Evidence for Reappointment,  
Promotion and Tenure**

**July 1, 2020**

## **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 scholarly/creative work, and effective leadership and 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.

## **Processes and Definitions:**

We do not use a Faculty Report on Professional Activities or the annual Merit Evaluations in our reappointment, promotion and tenure process.

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

As permitted in APS 1022, the faculty of the History Department have voted and approved a process that does not have a vote of the full department faculty as a step in the reappointment, promotion, and tenure process. As a standard practice, the History Department will rely on the evaluation of the primary unit committee (hereafter PUC).

For the purposes of this full document, the History Department defines these terms as follows:

“One's immediate instructional setting” means the teaching that occurs with students in one's regularly assigned and contractually-obligated teaching or in teaching compensated as overload work. Any teaching and learning or educational impacts not included in that “immediate instructional setting” are considered as “beyond” it, including impacts which take place at the level of the department, university, community, public, or nationally/internationally.

“Demonstrated achievement” for teaching may encompass any of the following: published writing, peer reviewed publications, public presentations, workshops, exhibits, digital formats, websites, or other forms of public pedagogy and public engagement which aim to educate, inform, and increase understandings among constituent groups.

### **Initial Reappointment Review:**

The candidate's total record, including teaching, scholarly/creative work and leadership and service, will be evaluated. The PUC will vote separately on the three categories of teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service as "on track for tenure", "not yet on track for tenure but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate corrections", and "not on track for tenure". The PUC will separately issue a recommendation regarding reappointment based on a PUC vote.

Teaching: The candidate's teaching will be evaluated by multiple means which will include, at a minimum, Faculty Course Questionnaires (FCQs) and two other means of evaluation. Due to the subjective nature of FCQs, the quantitative and qualitative feedback from FCQs should be considered in balance with other means of evaluating achievement, impact, and contributions in teaching. See the appendix to this document for examples of other means of evaluating teaching as well as the types of appropriate criteria for evaluating teaching. In addition to classroom teaching, the candidate's work with students outside of the classroom as a mentor, scholarly/research advisor, independent study director, or in similar roles will be considered here. The candidate will show potential for continued development as a teacher. Candidates will demonstrate that their courses are coherently organized and thoughtfully presented and that they deal with significant historical problems.

Furthermore, candidates will demonstrate a commitment to teaching, evidence of which will be committed 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.

Scholarly/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 digital formats as well as 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 reappointment review, the candidate will demonstrate a well-designed scholarly 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.

Leadership and service: The department recognizes leadership and service to the campus, community and our profession. At this stage, the candidate will be involved in departmental

meetings and activities. See the appendix of this document for a list of forms of leadership and service.

### **Comprehensive Reappointment Review:**

The candidate's record in teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership 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 program requirements of the primary unit will be considered only at the time of appointment and reappointment. The PUC will vote separately on the three categories of teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service as "on track for tenure", "not yet on track for tenure but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate corrections", and "not on track for tenure". The PUC will separately issue a recommendation regarding reappointment based on a PUC vote.

As stated above, per revised UCCS policy, as a general practice, the History Department will not solicit or use letters from external reviewers at the Comprehensive Reappointment Review. However, if a faculty member would like letters from external reviewers to be solicited and used for their Comprehensive Reappointment Review, then they must discuss this request with the Department Chair as well as the chair of their PUC by May 1 of the year that the Comprehensive Reappointment Review will occur. If external reviewer letters are solicited, then a total of three letters must be submitted or else none will be used in the review. The process for soliciting external reviewer letters and their use in the RPT process will be in accordance with the policy and process outlined at the campus Promotion and Tenure Review policy.

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. Due to the subjective nature of FCQs, the quantitative and qualitative feedback from FCQs should be considered in balance with other means of evaluating achievement, impact, and contributions in teaching. See the appendix to this document for examples of other means of evaluating teaching as well as the types of appropriate criteria for evaluating teaching. 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 will 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 include multiple measures of teaching evaluation and demonstrated achievement at the campus, local, national, and/or international level which furthers the practice and/or scholarship of teaching and learning beyond one's immediate instructional setting. 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.

Scholarly/ 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 digital formats as well as 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 will 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 reappointment review, a rating of meritorious requires reasonable progress toward tenure as demonstrated by submission of scholarly proposals, professional presentations, publications, and, if solicited, by the minimum three outside letters of evaluation of the candidate's work. A rating of excellent will also refer to outside letters for evaluation, if solicited, 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.

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

### **Promotion to Associate Professor and/or Awarding of Tenure Review:**

The candidate's record in teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership 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 scholarly/creative work. The PUC will vote separately on the three categories of teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service as "not meritorious", "meritorious", or "excellent." The PUC will separately issue a recommendation regarding promotion and/or tenure based on a PUC vote.

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. Due to the subjective nature of FCQs, the quantitative and qualitative feedback from FCQs should be considered in balance with other means of evaluating achievement, impact, and contributions in teaching. See the appendix to this document for examples of other means of evaluating teaching as well as the types of appropriate criteria for evaluating teaching. 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 will 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 include multiple measures of teaching evaluation and demonstrated achievement at the campus, local, national, and/or international level which furthers the practice and/or scholarship of teaching and learning beyond one's immediate instructional setting. 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.

Scholarly/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 digital formats as well as 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 will 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/or 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 scholarly/creative work activity.

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

### **Promotion to Full Professor Review:**

The candidate's record in teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership 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/or promotion to associate professor, that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching and working with students, scholarly/creative work, scholarship or creative work, and leadership and service."

Teaching: The candidate will demonstrate effective teaching evaluated by multiple means which will include, at a minimum, Faculty Course Questionnaires and two other means of evaluation. Due to the subjective nature of FCQs, the quantitative and qualitative feedback from FCQs should be considered in balance with other means of evaluating achievement, impact, and contributions in teaching. See the appendix to this document for examples of other means of evaluating teaching as well as the types of appropriate criteria for evaluating teaching. 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 will be considered here. The distinction drawn in prior sections of this document between "excellent" and "meritorious" teaching apply at this stage as well. They will include multiple measures of teaching evaluation and demonstrated achievement at the campus, local, national, and/or international level which furthers the practice and/or scholarship of teaching and learning beyond one's immediate instructional setting. 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 field.

Scholarly/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 digital formats as well as 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 will 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 scholarly/creative work 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 scholarly/creative work activity.

Leadership and service: The department recognizes leadership and service to the campus, community and to our profession. In evaluating leadership and service both the quality and quantity of leadership and service contributions will be considered. Substantial, significant and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in leadership and service since tenure must be demonstrated through a discussion of leadership and 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 leadership and 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. See the appendix to this document for examples of other means of evaluating teaching as well as the types of appropriate criteria for evaluating teaching, research/creative work, and leadership and service. Ratings of “exceeding expectations” or “outstanding” will be awarded for exceeding these standards.



## **APPENDIX**

### **EXAMPLES OF APPROPRIATE CRITERIA FOR FACULTY EVALUATION AND MATERIAL FOR INCLUSION IN DOSSIERS**

This is a list of suggestions and is neither all-inclusive nor a list of requirements.

Items are not ranked or grouped in any order of importance.

There is no expectation by the Department of History that these are the only things that might be used or that all of these items must be used.

#### **TEACHING**

1. Student Evaluation of Teaching
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. Advising and Mentoring of Students
7. Educating Teachers About Pedagogy at Any Educational Level Within or Beyond UCCS
8. Creativity and Innovation in Teaching
9. Participation in Teaching-Related Subject Activities
10. Effectiveness of Students in Succeeding Courses and/or in the Pursuit of Graduate Education and/or in Careers
11. Student Supervision in Professional Experience Activities, Internships, Research, Scholarships, and/or Independent Studies
12. Evaluation of Students in History MA, BA, Minor, and Certificate Degree Requirements
13. Preparation of Course Material
14. Student Development/Encouragement (Centers of Excellence, Library Knowledge, Learning Disability Recognition, Encouragement of Students, among other forms)
15. Course Organization
16. New Course Development, including Development of Courses in Different Modes, such as Online, Hybrid, Digital, Virtual, and/or Other Future Formats
17. Participating in Teaching Improvement Activity (Workshops, Trainings, Conferences)
18. Teaching Contribution at Any Institution in Addition to the University of Colorado Colorado Springs
19. Risk and/or Difficulty Factors Involved in the Teaching Venture
20. Contributions of Teaching to Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion
21. Pedagogical Community Outreach, e.g. Workshops and Activities Conducted for Teachers at Any Level Outside of UCCS
22. Creation of Teaching Related Documents
23. Letters of Recommendation Written for Students
24. Letters from Former Students
25. Observing, Writing Letters of Support, and/or Mentoring of Teachers at any level Within or Beyond UCCS
26. Development of New Academic Programs within and Beyond the Department (including interdisciplinary programs or degrees)
27. Scholarly Research and Presentation or Publication on Teaching and Learning or other

## Instructional Materials

28. Community Outreach, Teaching, and Activism on Issues related to Historical Understandings, Historical Skills, and Historical Analysis
29. Community Outreach, Teaching, and Activism on Issues related to Human, Social, Environmental, and Animal Justice as well as other forms of Oppression
30. Pedagogical Development Grants
31. Evidence Demonstrating Use of Publications for Instruction Outside our Institution

## **B. SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE WORK**

### Decisive Factors:

1. Peer Judged Articles and Book Chapters
2. Peer Judged/ Refereed Single-authored Books
3. Peer Judged/ Refereed Co-Authored Books
4. Edited Volumes from Refereed Presses
5. Edited Journal Special Issues
6. Peer Judged and/or Edited Digital Projects and Research, e.g. Programs, Methods and Theory, Artifacts, Archives and Collections, Web-Based “Living” Texts, and so on
7. Edited Research Works
8. Textbooks
9. Grant Applications Awarded
10. Fellowship Applications Awarded

### Contributing Factors:

11. Papers Submitted for Presentation at Professional Conferences and/or Workshops
12. Papers Accepted for Presentation at Professional Conferences and/or Workshops
13. Papers Presented at Professional Conferences and/or Workshops
14. Public Presentations of Research
15. Proposing and Organizing a Conference Panel
16. Chairing a Conference Panel by invitation
17. Chairing a Conference Panel
18. Non-Reviewed Digital Projects and Research, e.g. Programs, Artifacts, Archives, Web-Based “Living” Texts, and so on
19. Grant Application Submissions (awarded or not)
20. Exhibitions, Trans-Media, and/or Curatorial Work Related to Research (indicate stature of affiliated or sponsoring organization, or other measure of quality and peer review)
21. Creative Work (indicate quality of publication venue/ peer judged/refereed/edited or other measure)
22. New Media Productions, such as films, documentaries, websites, etc. (indicate quality of publication venue/ peer-judged/refereed/edited, affiliated or sponsoring organization, or other measure)
23. Performances (indicate quality of venue/ peer judged/refereed or other measure)
24. Readings (indicate quality of venue/ peer judged/refereed or other measure)
25. Unsponsored Research (indicate research contribution to field)
26. Professional Reputation (Both Inside and Outside University)

27. Evidence of Capacity for Future Achievements
28. Participation in Development Workshops
29. Participation in Career Development Activity (Workshops, Conference, Summer Schools, etc. Indicate stature of the affiliated or sponsoring organization, or other measure of quality and peer review.)
30. Long-Term Research Projects
31. Expert and Technical Consultation on Research Projects
32. Role Modeling and Mentoring of Research on Any Educational Level
33. Risk and/or Difficulty Factors Involved in the Research Venture
34. Peer Reviewed publications in Conference Proceedings
35. Reviewing Books in Scholarly Journals
36. Contributions to Diversity
37. Exhibits in Scholarly Venues (indicate stature of the affiliated or sponsoring organization, or other measure of quality and peer review)
38. Inclusion of Undergraduates in Research
39. Non-Refereed Publications (indicate stature of the affiliated or sponsoring organization, or other measure of quality)
40. Recognition by other Scholars of Research and Publications

### **C. LEADERSHIP AND SERVICE**

1. University Committees
2. Administrative Service
3. Service to the Profession and Discipline (Local, State, National, International Level)
4. Consultation and Public Service
5. Letters of Recommendation or Support for Colleagues
6. Nominating Students or Colleagues for Fellowships, Awards, etc.
7. Non-Reviewed Digital Public Humanities Projects
8. Non-Reviewed Digital Humanities Projects Prepared for Professional Organizations
9. Digital Humanities Projects Prepared for the Public/Community
10. Mentoring on Any Educational Level
11. Reviewing Research Proposals
12. Reviewing Grant Proposals
13. Refereeing Book Manuscripts, Article Manuscripts, and/or Conference Paper Proposals
14. Attending Commencement Ceremonies
15. Participation at Professional Conferences, Specifically Organizational Activities (Organizational Activities, Local Planning Committees, Site Visit Details, Activities Involved in Local, Regional and National Meetings, etc.)
16. Membership In and/or Office-holding in Professional Associations
17. Service Contribution to Education at Any Level and at Any Institution in Addition to the University of Colorado
18. Contributions in Faculty Governance
19. Contributions of Service to Diversity
20. Managerial and/or Curatorial Work as Service

**College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences**  
**Department of History**  
**RPT Criteria**  
**Version History**

***Version 1: Initial Version***

Approved by the History tenured/tenure track faculty, 04/17/2020

Approved by Interim Dean Rex Welshon, 04/22/2020

Approved by Provost Tom Christensen, 6/27/2020

Effective date, 7/1/2020

---