

Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Policy

Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards and Processes

Academic Unit: Department of History

Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in APRs and EPRs of NTTF in Years One-Six

Annual performance will be assessed by the Chair, who will consider the quality of instruction delivered by NTTF, the NTTF's participation in service activities, and the NTTF's research (if applicable according to the candidate's terms of appointment and assigned duties). Student evaluations of teaching shall not constitute the sole criterion for the evaluation of faculty teaching performance. Performance is deemed satisfactory in the event that NTTF receive a positive peer evaluation, earn quantitative evaluation scores that are comparable to or exceed the department average, and qualitative responses do not raise significant red flags that could indicate the instructor is not meeting minimal standards in the classroom. Peer evaluations that indicate the NTTF is engaging students in the classroom and is effectively teaching the appropriate curriculum will be deemed positive. Peer evaluations that include constructive feedback may still be viewed as positive evaluations. For instructors whose quantitative evaluations are substantially below (i.e., 0.5 points or more on the 5-point scale) the department average for comparable courses, the Chair may turn to additional evidence such as course materials (e.g., syllabi, assignments, and so forth) and peer evaluations of teaching to determine whether the instructor is performing adequately. In the event the instructor is deemed to not be performing adequately in his/her position, the Chair may provide guidance on how the NTTF can improve his/her performance or recommend to the Dean that the NTTF not be renewed.

Enhanced Performance Review criteria largely parallel those guiding APRs, but span the past three years of performance and include additional evidence of teaching effectiveness. NTTF will not only be evaluated on their student evaluations and peer classroom evaluations but also on the quality of their teaching, service, and research (if assessed) philosophy statements and course materials. First, strong candidates will typically have quantitative teaching evaluation scores that comparable with or exceed the department average. Second, they will have qualitative evaluations that are largely devoid of feedback indicating the instructor does not meet minimum standards in the classroom. Third, strong candidates will have received peer evaluations of their teaching each year that indicate they engage and communicate effectively with students. Finally, strong candidates will have implemented course materials (e.g., syllabi, assignments, etc) that are rigorous yet also at the appropriate level and aligned with the department's curriculum. NTTF will also be evaluated on their service activities, which should include participation in a department committee every year as well as some service to the college or university. Regional or national level service is desirable but not required. Typically, successful candidates being evaluated for a research component should demonstrate research activity that culminate in research productivity by the end of the six year period (i.e. at the time of promotion).

Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of NTTF APR and EPR Materials

Annual Performance Reviews shall require that the NTTF member submit their Faculty Record Update (FRU) with his/her curriculum vitae (CV) to the Chair.

Enhanced Performance Reviews shall require that the NTTF member compile a dossier consisting of his/her curriculum vitae (CV) and the following additional supporting materials:

- Teaching philosophy narrative (no more than three single-spaced pages) that describes the candidate's approach to teaching
- Quantitative and qualitative course evaluations for all courses taught in the past three years
- Peer teaching evaluations (minimum of three from at least three different faculty of higher rank than the candidate and obtained in each of the past three academic years)
- Course materials, including syllabi, assignments, and so forth, for three courses. For online courses, provide additional materials such as discussion board content, audio lectures, or other elements that demonstrate teaching effectiveness. Materials that demonstrate teaching innovation are encouraged but not required.
- Service philosophy narrative summarizing the candidate's service activities over the past three years and goals for the future, and documentation of service activities.
- A research narrative and evidence of research activity, if applicable.

Unit Faculty Involvement in the NTTF APR Process

APRs of NTTF are conducted by the Chair/Director in accordance with the unit's criteria.

Academic Unit Criteria and Standards used in NTTF Promotion Review

1. Criteria for Promotion from Instructor to Lecturer

Promotion to Lecturer in the Department of History requires a Ph.D. from an accredited college or university; evidence of effective teaching and service to the department and to the college, university, community, or discipline; and, if applicable to the candidate, research contributions commensurate with their terms of appointment or assigned duties. Eligible candidates may submit their materials for promotion to the Chair at their discretion after at least six years in rank of Instructor and two successful EPRs.

Successful candidates for promotion to Lecturer must demonstrate a commitment to instructional excellence and to student success in achieving learning outcomes. This is typically evidenced by consistently positive quantitative teaching evaluations that are comparable with or exceed the department average at the same course level, and by receiving mostly positive peer evaluations completed by faculty of a higher rank with no more than two such evaluations from the same faculty member in any single evaluation period. Candidates must also demonstrate success in at least **two** additional performance indicators used in the evaluation of teaching effectiveness (see following section) in the most recent six years as Instructor. In terms of service effectiveness, the candidate should provide clear evidence that s/he has consistently fulfilled his or her responsibilities to serve annually on one or more departmental committees during the six most recent years as well as demonstrating success in at least **two** additional performance indicators used in the evaluation of service (see following section). Candidates must also provide evidence of continuous engagement with contemporary scholarship in the field as demonstrated by such criteria as attendance at professional conferences and workshops, and involvement in professional organizations. If applicable, successful candidates should also provide evidence of research activity commensurate with the apportioned assigned duties for research in the candidate's terms of appointment and the percentage subsequently agreed upon by the candidate and the department chair. Typically, successful candidates will have a record of scholarship that includes at least one peer-reviewed article-length publication as well as other appropriate forms of dissemination, such as peer-reviewed conference presentations, but the scholarship will be appraised within the context of its quality and its influence in the field.

2. Criteria for Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

Promotion to Senior Lecturer in the Department of History requires a Ph.D. from an accredited college or university; evidence of effective teaching and service to the department and to the college, university, community, or discipline; and, if applicable to the candidate, research contributions commensurate with their assigned duties.

Successful candidates for promotion to Senior Lecturer must demonstrate a commitment to instructional excellence and to student success in achieving learning outcomes. This is typically evidenced by consistently positive quantitative teaching evaluations that are comparable with or exceed the department average (at the same course level), qualitative student responses that indicate effective instruction, and by receiving positive peer evaluations completed by faculty of a higher rank with no more than two such evaluations from the same faculty member in any single evaluation period. Candidates must also

demonstrate success in at least **four** additional performance indicators used in the evaluation of teaching effectiveness (see following section) in the most recent six years as Lecturer. In terms of service effectiveness, the candidate should provide clear evidence that s/he has consistently fulfilled his or her responsibilities to serve annually on one or more departmental committees during the six most recent years as well as demonstrating success in at least **four** additional performance indicators used in the evaluation of service (see following section).

Candidates must also provide evidence of continuous engagement with contemporary scholarship in the field as demonstrated by such criteria as attendance at professional conferences and workshops, and involvement in professional organizations. If applicable, successful candidates should also provide evidence of research activity commensurate with the apportioned assigned duties for research in the candidate's terms of appointment and the percentage subsequently agreed upon by the candidate and the department chair. Typically, successful candidates will have a record of scholarship that includes at least one peer-reviewed article-length publication as well as other appropriate forms of dissemination, such as peer-reviewed conference presentations, but the scholarship will be appraised within the context of its quality and its influence in the field.

Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of NTTF Promotion Materials

Requests for Promotion shall require that the NTTF member compile a dossier consisting of his/her curriculum vitae (CV) and the following additional supporting materials:

- Teaching philosophy narrative (no more than three single-spaced pages) that describes the candidate's approach to teaching
- Quantitative and qualitative course evaluations for all courses taught in the past six years
- Peer teaching evaluations: A minimum of three from at least three different faculty of higher rank than the candidate for promotion to Lecturer; a minimum of three from at least three different faculty of equal or higher rank than the candidate for promotion to Senior Lecturer.
- Service philosophy narrative (no more than two single-spaced pages) summarizing the candidate's service activities over the past six years and goals for the future as well as appropriate documentation of service activities.
- If applicable to the candidate, a research narrative summarizing the candidate's research activities over the past six years and goals for the future, and examples of the candidate's scholarly work (books, book chapters, articles).
- Additional Performance Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness (minimum of two different indicators for promotion to Lecturer and four different indicators for promotion to Senior Lecturer)
 - Teaching awards or nominations;
 - Evidence of contributions to improving student success in achieving learning

- outcomes.
- Evidence of new courses developed, existing courses substantially improved, or courses adapted for online delivery;
 - Evidence of effective use of instructional technology, innovation in pedagogical approaches, and design of assessments that promote student learning and the acquisition of learning outcomes;
 - Instructional grants;
 - Evidence of collaborative teaching (e.g., team teaching, coordinating linked courses, guest lecturing);
 - Evidence of other contributions to student learning that fall outside the standard curriculum (e.g., independent studies, Honors theses advised, supervising research or teaching internships, arranging panels for student participation, teaching or co-curricular engagement with themed or residential learning communities, etc.);
 - Significant mentorship of graduate students in teaching and pedagogy, beyond the basic requirements of managing assigned Teaching/Research Assistants;
 - Evidence of participation in or leadership of professional development activities - such as teaching workshops or learning communities , designed to improve teaching (e.g., teaching workshops or learning communities);
 - Scholarly or creative activities that contribute to teaching expertise (such as publications and national conference presentations in the scholarship of teaching and learning, to the extent that it is not double-counted under Research);
 - Presentations at regional or national disciplinary conferences about teaching or pedagogy;
 - Other indicators of teaching effectiveness of an equivalent caliber may be considered.
- Additional Performance Indicators of Effective Service (minimum of two different indicators for promotion to Lecturer and four different indicators for promotion to Senior Lecturer)
 - Membership on college or university committees or advisory boards;
 - Documentation of work with student organizations;
 - Evidence of service within the local community related to the candidate's scholarly discipline;
 - Service work (eg, committee membership, chairing/commenting on panels) for regional or national disciplinary organizations (e.g, the Ohio Academy of History, Society for Historians of the Early Republic);
 - Other evidence that documents the candidate's service to the college, university, local community, or discipline that are not considered in this list may be considered.

Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in APRs and EPRs of TTF

The Chair conducts Annual performance reviews (APR) each year the faculty member is on the tenure track. Successful candidates will demonstrate effective teaching; research activity that culminates in peer-reviewed publications; and service at the department level. As they progress on the tenure track, successful candidates will demonstrate an accumulation of teaching, research, and service activities that reflect a growth in productivity (both quality and quantity) over the six year period. Initially, candidates are launching their research careers and thus during the first and second year APRs, manuscripts under review or revision are demonstrative of research activity which signals likely research productivity (e.g., publications in peer-reviewed journals). Following a successful Enhanced Performance Review during the third year, successful candidates for the fourth and fifth year annual reviews will show sustained (or increased) research activity as well as research productivity, including the publication of peer-reviewed journal articles or book chapters. Similarly, successful candidates will evidence strong teaching effectiveness from the outset or demonstrate sustained improvement over time, ultimately comparable with or exceeding departmental averages in their teaching evaluations, receiving positive peer evaluations, preparing and implementing rigorous course materials, and making meaningful contributions to the department's teaching mission. Candidates will also show evidence some involvement in graduate student theses and dissertations (if applicable) through committee membership. Finally, the scope and level of service engaged in by successful candidates will increase over the six year period, expanding from solely department-level service to college or university service and contributions to their discipline at the regional or national level. During years 1 and 2 on the tenure track, candidates may only have department level service, but they should be seeking opportunities to contribute at the college or university levels, and to their discipline at the regional or national levels. By years 3, 4, and 5, successful candidates will have contributed meaningful service to the college or university and to their profession at the regional or national levels, as well as their annual department level service.

The Enhanced Performance Review (EPR) typically occurs during the fall semester of the candidate's third year on the tenure track. At this point, the candidate must demonstrate success in teaching, research, and service. Specifically, to demonstrate success in teaching, criteria include quantitative teaching evaluations that are consistently comparable with or exceed the department average (at the same course level), qualitative student responses that indicate effective instruction, and primarily positive peer evaluations. Research success shall be indicated by research *productivity*, namely books, articles, or book chapters published or in press since the initial hire. Journal quality is an important factor and the department favors publications in national-level journals over regional journals. Refereed publications are given greater weight than non-refereed publications. Manuscripts under review will be considered, and those that have received an invitation to revise and resubmit will be viewed more favorably than those merely under review. Grant activity (submission or receipt) is desirable but not necessary for a successful EPR as it is secondary to publication activity. Scholarly production in public history (such as exhibits, documentary editions, digital humanities projects among others) may be considered equivalent to journal articles. In determining the equivalence, the following criteria must be taken into account: rigorous documentation of sources, a critical perspective on the subject (as opposed to a

celebratory tone), external peer reviews, and the prestige of the venue or sponsor (e.g. accredited museum, a website sponsored or funded by a national organization, etc).

Other indicators of research activity of relevance include presentations at regional or national meetings and invited talks. The successful candidate normally will have one or more published or in- press journal articles (or equivalent) since initial hire and others under review or in preparation for submission to a journal. Service on a department committee each year is required. Ideally, the candidate shall have pursued service at the university (or college) level and be beginning to participate in some service to the discipline at the regional or national level (e.g., organize a session at a regional or national meeting, serve as a manuscript reviewer for journals, etc.).

Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of TTF APR and EPR Materials

1. Annual Performance Reviews shall require that the TTF member submit their Faculty Record Update (FRU) with his/her curriculum vitae (CV) to the Chair. Additional material, such as copies of publications, may be requested by the chair. The Chair provides student evaluations.
2. Enhanced Performance Reviews shall require that the TTF member compile a dossier consisting of his/her curriculum vitae (CV) and the following additional supporting materials:
 - Teaching philosophy narrative (no more than three single-spaced pages) that describes the candidate's approach to teaching
 - Quantitative and qualitative course evaluations for all courses taught in the past three years
 - Peer teaching evaluations (minimum of three from at least three different faculty of higher rank than the candidate)
 - Course materials that demonstrate teaching innovation and/or commitment to instructional excellence and student success are encouraged but not required.
 - Service philosophy narrative (no more than two single-spaced pages) summarizing the candidate's service activities over the past three years and goals for the future.
 - Research narrative (no more than three single-spaced pages) that describes the candidate's research contributions.
 - Copies of published scholarly work (books, book chapters, articles).

Unit Faculty Involvement in the TTF APR Process

1. The Department Chair conducts the Annual Performance Reviews (APR) in consultation with the voting faculty (as described in point #2 below). The review shall evaluate the probationary tenure-track faculty member's progress in teaching, research or creative work, and service in accordance with the reappointment policy.
2. The Chair will circulate among the voting faculty (i.e. tenured associate and full professors) the APR materials, and a draft of her/his letter and recommendation. He/she will solicit written feedback to her/his assessment of the progress of the

probationary faculty. In the letter to the Dean and the Provost/VPAA, the Chair will include her/his assessment and recommendation, as well as the feedback of the voting faculty.

Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in TTF Tenure and Promotion Review

Criteria for Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with tenure is based on convincing evidence that the candidate has developed an independent research identity and is regularly publishing high quality research. The candidate must also provide documentation of effective teaching and active service during their probationary period at BGSU. Finally, they must show promise of sustained productivity in all three areas, especially the dedication to establish a national reputation for scholarship. The criteria that follows is based upon the typical balance of assigned duties for an Assistant Professor in the Department of History of 50% Teaching, 30% Research, and 20% Service. The department must consider exceptions to this allocation that have been approved by the Chair and the Dean, and adjust the criteria that follows accordingly.

Candidates must demonstrate a commitment to instructional excellence and to student success in achieving learning outcomes. This is typically evidenced by consistently positive quantitative teaching evaluations that are comparable with or exceed the department average (at the same course level), qualitative student responses that indicate effective instruction, and primarily positive peer evaluations. Successful teaching also normally involves committee membership on **two** or more graduate student theses and dissertations. Candidates must also demonstrate success in at least **four** other performance indicators of teaching effectiveness, which may include:

- Teaching awards or nominations;
- Evidence of contributions to improving student success in achieving learning outcomes.
- Evidence of new courses developed, existing courses substantially improved, or courses adapted for online delivery;
- Evidence of effective use of instructional technology, innovation in pedagogical approaches, and design of assessments that that promote student learning and the acquisition of learning outcomes;
- Instructional grants;
- Evidence of collaborative teaching (e.g, team teaching, coordinating linked courses, guest lecturing);
- Evidence of other contributions to student learning that fall outside the standard curriculum (e.g., independent studies, Honors theses advised, supervising research or teaching internships, arranging panels for student participation, engagement with themed or residential learning communities , etc.);
- Significant mentorship of graduate students in teaching and pedagogy,

beyond the basic requirements of managing assigned Teaching/Research Assistants;

- Evidence of participation in or leadership of professional development activities - such as teaching workshops or faculty learning communities , designed to improve teaching (e.g., teaching workshops or learning communities);
- Scholarly or creative activities that contribute to teaching expertise (such as publications and national conference presentations in the scholarship of teaching and learning, to the extent that it is not double-counted under Research);
- Presentations at regional or national disciplinary conferences about teaching or pedagogy;
- Other indicators of teaching effectiveness of an equivalent caliber may be considered.

Research *productivity* is essential for candidates to be promoted to Associate Professor. Candidates must be productive researchers as evidenced by refereed articles published or in press since the initial hire. Books published or in press by a recognized scholarly press (or major commercial press) are most desirable and typically carry more weight than articles or book chapters depending on the quality, length, and originality (i.e., the extent to which the content does not overlap with other published works). Journal or press quality is a leading indicator of the caliber of the scholarship produced by the candidate and consequently the department favors publications in top specialty (and general) journals and academic presses. Generally, refereed publications are given greater weight than non-refereed publications. Work in collaboration will be evaluated as equivalent to single-authored work if each author was actively engaged in the analysis, research and writing, and the whole body of work is consistent with the principle of an independent research identity. Scholarly production in public history (such as exhibits, documentary editions, digital humanities projects among others) may be considered equivalent to journal articles. In determining the equivalence, the following criteria must be taken into account: rigorous documentation of sources, a critical perspective on the subject (as opposed to a celebratory tone), external peer reviews, and the prestige of the venue or sponsor (e.g. accredited museum, a website sponsored or funded by a national or state organization, etc).

Research *activity* signals eventual productivity and demonstrates an ongoing stream of scholarship. Manuscripts under review will be considered, and those that have received an invitation to revise and resubmit will be viewed much more favorably than those under review. External grant submission is another desirable indicator of research activity and is viewed positively, but is not necessary for promotion to Associate Professor. Faculty are expected to seek grants and funding opportunities from appropriate sources given their research specialties. Other relevant indicators of research activity include presentations at regional, national, or international meetings and invited talks which attest to the reputation of the candidate. External reviewers will evaluate the candidate's research record and their conclusions will be considered in the department's assessment of the candidate's research performance.

The assessment of a candidate's research record for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor involves consideration of both research productivity and activity. The principal consideration is whether a candidate's program of scholarship, as a contribution to the discipline, shows the level of quality and productivity commensurate with an emerging national/international reputation. Typically, successful candidates will have either a book-length academic monograph (published or in press) or have at least **four** article-length refereed publications or the equivalent. No more than two articles may be substituted for by exhibits and similar public history production, and at least two articles have to be exclusively authored by the reviewed candidate. In all cases, the number of publications will be appraised within the context of the quality of each publication (including the quality of the venue) and its influence in the field. The candidate's research record will form a coherent whole, establishing the candidate as a recognized scholar in a specific topical area. The expected impact of the candidate's body of work on the field is also a relevant consideration.

Consistent active service on a department committee each year is required. Also, the candidate shall have made meaningful service contributions to the college or the university (e.g., serve on committees or academic program advisory boards, advise student organizations).

The candidate is also expected to have provided some service to the discipline, such as:

- organize or comment on a session at a regional or national meeting;
- serve as a manuscript reviewer for academic journals or presses;
- publish book review;
- serve on an award committee;
- participate in the business meeting of national organizations;

Though not required, the candidate may also have provided service to the community related to their discipline. These service activities set the stage for continued development at all levels within the university and the discipline.

Criteria for Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor

Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor is based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has achieved and can be expected to maintain a sustained record of excellence in teaching, research, and service. Successful candidates will have attained a national reputation in the field through outstanding scholarship and service to the discipline. Candidates for Professor should show consistent achievement for several years before seeking promotion.

Demonstration of a commitment to instructional excellence and to student success in achieving learning outcomes is typically evidenced by consistently positive quantitative teaching evaluations that are comparable with or exceed the department average (at the same course level), as well as at least six indicators of teaching effectiveness (see section above) and several examples of teaching leadership. Teaching leadership is defined broadly and can include serving as a teaching mentor for others (faculty, graduate students, and undergraduate students) in the department; mentoring undergraduate and graduate students beyond routine management of teaching assistantships; supervising undergraduate and graduate students in independent studies and internships; supervising undergraduate students in Honors projects and CURS research projects; contributing to significant curricular changes, including the creation of new courses;

teaching courses that are difficult to staff; extensive advising of graduate students through chairing Master's thesis committees or Plan II exam committees; leadership in university or national level teaching workshops; pedagogical publications; or awards or honors.

Successful candidates will have maintained an accomplished research record while an associate professor. Sustained research productivity is the key element demonstrating research success, as indicated by publications in peer reviewed journals (especially the top field-specific and general journals valued by the department), symposium volumes, anthologies, collections of primary documents, and/or book-length refereed monographs published by a recognized scholarly press or a major commercial press. Other significant indicators of research excellence may include editing a special issue of a journal, a book or an encyclopedia; publishing work that receives awards; organizing a conference; authoring a major review article (e.g., for *Reviews in American History*, *Oxford Bibliographies on Line*, or featured H-Net Roundtable Review); leading a public history project (such as exhibits, documentary editions, digital humanities projects among others) based on rigorous documentation of sources, a critical perspective, and implemented in an accredited museum, or a website sponsored by a national or regional organization. Typically, successful candidates will have either a book-length academic monograph published or six article-length refereed publications since promotion to Associate. One of those article-length refereed publications may be replaced by another indicator of research excellence listed above. In all cases, the number of publications will be appraised within the context of the quality of each publication and its influence in the field. Work in collaboration will be evaluated as equivalent to single-authored work if each author was actively engaged in the analysis, research and writing, and the whole body of work is consistent with the principle of an independent research identity. At least half of the publications must be single authored. Research success for promotion to Professor is indicated not solely by publications, but also the broader impact of the faculty member's work on the field. Measures of this include citations counts, impact factor of journals, and reviews of the candidate's production. External grant receipt as an associate professor is not required but definitely attests to quality of the candidate's research agenda. Candidates should make active efforts to seek external support from appropriate sources given their research specialties. External reviewers will assess the candidate's prominence in the field and the department will use these external assessments to gauge the candidate's scholarly impact.

Substantial service to the department, university, and the profession is additionally required for promotion to Professor. Service activities should involve leadership roles, such as committee chair on departmental committees or leadership within substantive area committees. Candidates should demonstrate mentoring of faculty colleagues within the department. At the college/university level the successful candidate must demonstrate active service such as membership in college/university-level committees, advising student organizations, or comparable activities. High quality service at the national or regional level is required and may be demonstrated by serving on editorial boards, participating on grant review panels, attending organizational business meetings, volunteering for committees, or being elected to committee membership. Engaged scholarship activities such as the dissemination or translation of research to larger audiences is another indicator of service at the national level.

Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of Tenure and Promotion Materials for TTF

Requests for Promotion shall require that the TTF member compile a dossier consisting of his/her curriculum vitae (CV) and the following additional supporting materials:

- Teaching philosophy narrative (no more than three single-spaced pages) that describes the candidate's teaching trajectory, including how their current activities and accomplishments to date support their long-term objectives.
- Quantitative and qualitative course evaluations for all courses taught since appointment or promotion.
- Peer teaching evaluations: A minimum of three from at least three different faculty of higher rank than the candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor; a minimum of three from at least three different faculty members of equal or higher rank for candidates for promotion to Full Professor collected since the last promotion.
- Additional performance indicators of teaching effectiveness as described in the "Criteria and Standards" section.
- Research narrative (no more than three single-spaced pages) summarizing the candidate's research trajectory, including how their current activities and accomplishments to date support their long-term objectives.
- Copies of scholarly work (books, book chapters, articles).
- Service philosophy narrative (no more than two single-spaced pages) summarizing the candidate's trajectory in service activities, including how their current activities and accomplishments to date support their long-term objectives.
- Additional performance indicators of service to the college, university, local community, or discipline, listed in the Criteria and Standards section.

Approved by the Department of History on September 6, 2017 through an electronic vote after discussion of the document at the August 30, 2017 Faculty Meeting.


Amílcar E. Challú, Chair

Date 9/6/2017

Approved: 
Raymond A. Craig, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

Date 9/11/2017

Approved: 
Rodney Rogers, Provost/Senior VP

Date 9/20/17