

**History Department
Linfield University
Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
REVISED DRAFT
3.1.21**

The History Department has developed the following guidelines for the evaluation of teaching effectiveness, professional achievement, and service. The guidelines articulate the expectations of the department in each of these areas and may only be changed by formal action of the History Department, with the approval of the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee and the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS). Members of the department should use this document to guide their thinking about their own teaching, professional activity, and service, to evaluate their own work or the work of their departmental colleagues as part of the regular review process described in the Linfield Faculty Handbook, and to prepare materials for their own applications for tenure or promotion or for the applications of other members of the department.

In order to be successful, candidates for tenure or promotion must meet the expectations of the department and college in each of the three areas of teaching, professional achievement, and service. The Linfield Faculty Handbook (IV.6.2) defines teaching effectiveness as the most important of the three evaluation categories for the purposes of tenure and promotion, a position that the History Department recognizes and supports, but it also makes clear that candidates must demonstrate excellence in all three areas.

These guidelines assume a department member who has been hired by the college at the rank of Assistant Professor. The History Department does not anticipate being able to recommend a candidate for tenure without promotion to Associate Professor: hence the reference throughout this document to “tenure and promotion to Associate Professor” as a single process of review. In the case of a member of the department hired at the rank of Associate Professor, who will thus subsequently apply either for tenure or for tenure and promotion to Professor, the expectations of the department will be laid out explicitly for the faculty member at the time of hire and as part of the regular review process. Those expectations may vary according to the prior accomplishments of the candidate, but in general, Associate Professors applying for tenure will be expected to have demonstrated an excellent record of teaching at Linfield, to have published a peer-reviewed historical monograph (or its equivalent), and to have met the service requirements for members of the department applying for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, including at least one of the optional possibilities for service. Candidates applying for tenure and promotion to Professor will be expected to have a record of teaching effectiveness, professional achievement, and service equivalent to that of tenured Associate Professors applying for promotion to Professor.

The History Department sees this document, and the expectations for members of the department that it articulates, as contributions to the college’s realization of its ongoing Strategic Plan. The plan sets as its first goal the strengthening of the college’s academic programs, and it envisions Linfield graduates as persons who will know how to think in a variety of settings; will be able to engage, learn from, and learn with a wide variety of individuals and communities; will possess

practical skills developed in both academic and experiential settings; will understand the complexities of value and purpose; and will be able to articulate to themselves, to employers, and to others the central features and benefits of their Linfield experience. The History Department believes that students' progress towards these goals will be advanced by the shared commitment of the members of the department to excellence in teaching, to historical scholarship and other forms of professional achievement, and to active, engaged service to the department, college, and discipline of history.

1. Teaching Effectiveness

The History Department views teaching as central to the mission of the department and the most important everyday responsibility of its members. The department recognizes a broad range of strategies that can contribute to effective teaching and is not committed to any single pedagogical approach or disciplinary methodology. It expects simply that members of the department will engage students in dialogue with the past and introduce them to the practice of history as a scholarly discipline.

Faculty members teaching in the department should bear in mind the criteria for teaching effectiveness codified in the Linfield Faculty Handbook (IV.6.1.1):

1. knowledge of and enthusiasm for the subject matter
2. attention to the organization of courses as it relates to the level and preparation of the students
3. organization and effective use of class time
4. high expectations for each student
5. respect for students' viewpoints
6. use of effective and fair grading methods
7. what students take from their courses
8. availability for consultation with students
9. consistent and effective attention to the needs of advisees.

In addition, members of the department should draw on the American Historical Association's (AHA) statement on excellence in the teaching of history:

Traditional measures of instructional quality—basic teaching skills, faculty availability to students, a well thought-out syllabus—are necessary but by themselves no longer sufficient for assuring that the conditions for effective teaching and learning exist. Although the missions of educational institutions may vary, the American Historical Association affirms that legislatures, governing boards, school administrators, and historians must work together to ensure that the criteria listed below are clearly present in their history courses for both majors and non-majors and are supported by the institution's operations and environment.

1. **Course Content.** *All courses must contain sufficient factual material to enable students to understand the central themes and issues present in the course. Factual material must be based on the most recent research findings. Historical research has*

expanded our understanding of the past in dramatic ways over the last twenty years, and this process continues. History instructors must have opportunity and motivation to integrate relevant results in their course content. Historical facts should be treated, however, as the beginning rather than the final goal of historical study. Courses must explicitly present the analytical concepts characteristic of historical study. These concepts not only underlie the questions that historians ask of the past, they help historians organize evidence, evaluate its relation to other evidence, and determine the relative importance of different events in shaping the past and present. These concepts address sequence, change over time, cause and effect, the role of factors such as culture and technology in shaping the history of the period, and the importance of the insights of all major social and cultural groupings in the society being studied. A true examination of the past requires attention to the full range of human activities and institutions, including politics, society, culture, economy, intellectual trends, and international relations.

- 2. *Historical Thinking.*** *Textbooks and well-delivered lectures sometimes give students the impression that the study of history is the quest for the single correct answer, because these end products of study conceal the historian's struggle with the indeterminacy associated with conflicting evidence and multiple viewpoints. For this reason excellent historical courses go beyond the presentation of content and analytical concepts to provide students with multiple opportunities to do the work of the historian. Students need to be aware of the kinds of sources used by historians, and they should become adept at extracting meaning from these sources, comparing their findings with other evidence from the period, formulating conclusions about the issue under study, and testing these ideas against additional evidence and the ideas of other historians. Students should be taught to think historically, to have the opportunity to develop their own historical interpretations, because this transforms their formal study of the past into a true understanding of the ways that conflicting evidence, alternative perspectives, and society's concerns shape our evaluations of the past. For these reasons students should be given frequent opportunities for discussion and writing in order to learn to practice the art of interpretation and to see the implications of their own analyses. These experiences should be progressive with the work at each level or grade, building on the studies that students carried out in prior courses. Historical thinking also contributes to the important educational goals of producing a thoughtful citizenry and of providing individuals with the analytical skills suitable to a wide range of jobs.*

Members of the History Department should evaluate their own teaching and that of their colleagues on the basis of the criteria listed in the Linfield Faculty Handbook (IV.6.1.1), informed by the disciplinary-specific expectations embodied in the AHA statement above. The criteria for evaluating teaching effectiveness do not differ according to the rank of the faculty member under review and apply equally to candidates for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor. The recommendation for tenure, as a "future-oriented decision" (see the Linfield Faculty Handbook IV.6.7.5) should incorporate a judgment about the development of the candidate's teaching effectiveness in the period of review and its likely trajectory in the future.

Colleague appraisals should rest on a thorough examination of the faculty member's file for the period under review, including the following elements:

- Course syllabi should reflect the faculty member's up-to-date knowledge of the subject matter of the course (criterion #1) and convey a clear sense of the requirements and expectations of the course (criteria #2, 4, 6, 8).
- Student teaching evaluations should be analyzed carefully for evidence of the faculty member's effectiveness as defined by criteria #1-8. Though the department does not set any numerical standards for student teaching evaluations and cautions against attaching too much significance to individual comments or to the evaluations for a single course, it does expect that the student evaluations as a whole will provide substantial evidence of the faculty member's effectiveness as a teacher.
- The candidate's narrative self-appraisals should communicate clearly the faculty member's thoughtful, reflective engagement with his or her own practices as a teacher. Candidates should take care not simply to summarize student evaluations and other elements of the file, but to provide the other members of the department the material with which to make a confident judgment about the candidate's ongoing commitment to successful teaching.

Colleague appraisals should also draw on direct observation of the faculty member's teaching. The faculty member under review should arrange colleague visits to class as part of the regular review process and at the time of application for tenure or promotion. In the case of applications for tenure or promotion, members of the department should have sufficient evidence drawn from direct observation of the candidate's teaching in order to complement their evaluation of the candidate's file with evidence drawn from class visits.

Please note that teaching in the Linfield Online and Continuing Education (OCE) program shall be counted as service for courses taught prior to July 1, 2019; after July 1, 2019 OCE teaching should be evaluated as part of a candidate's record of teaching effectiveness. (See Faculty Handbook, IV.6)

The department expects all members of the department to contribute to the collective instructional needs of the department and college. If needed, members of the department are expected to demonstrate a willingness to teach at all levels of the departmental curriculum, to take their turn teaching the three courses required of History majors (History 090, 285, and 485), and to offer courses that are important for both the department and the larger college (Linfield Curriculum courses, January Term courses, and/or Inquiry Seminars). In addition, members of the department are expected to serve as conscientious, effective advisors to first- and second-year students and to History majors.

The following are common indicators of "meritorious work" and "special merit" (Linfield Faculty handbook, IV.6.7.4) in teaching:

- Evidence of innovation in pedagogy

- Significant role in curriculum development (including, but not limited to, new course development, improvements in course design and content, and incorporating innovative techniques)
- Evidence of teaching effectiveness as per course evaluations and peer observation
- Participation in Faculty-Student Collaborative research (as a form of teaching, depending on dissemination of research)

2. Professional Achievement

The History Department expects all members of the department to build a record of scholarly accomplishment as historians. Linfield students benefit in myriad ways from the opportunity to work with scholars engaged in active historical research and publication, and the department views a collective commitment to historical scholarship as the necessary foundation of its efforts to fulfill its obligations to Linfield students inside and outside the classroom. Toward that end, we have identified and defined activities that may be counted as evidence of professional achievement in History. The list below is not exhaustive, however, as modes of dissemination and public outreach are continually evolving. It is incumbent upon the candidate to explain the significance of the work and how it relates to their professional goals and overall achievement. Candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or to Professor should be sure to explain how evidence of professional achievement is consonant with the language provided in the Faculty Handbook (e.g. tenure as a “future-oriented decision” or “special merit” for promotion to Professor).

A. Description of Activities

Peer-Reviewed Publications

For many years, the American historical profession has defined the peer-reviewed monograph as the principal, and most valued form, of historical scholarship. The History Department expects that this will continue at least into the near future, though it recognizes the rapid changes underway in the publishing industry and in the mechanisms by which historical knowledge is produced and disseminated, including digital scholarship and public history. Nevertheless, we expect all members of the department to publish a peer-reviewed historical monograph as the principal evidence for their admission to the guild of professional historians. In this context, peer review refers to the process by which university presses, commercial publishers, and other publishing bodies form a judgment about publication on the basis of recommendations by anonymous referees with expertise in the subject matter of the submitted manuscript. Usually, referees do not know the author’s identity and authors do not know the identities of the referees.

Candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are expected to provide substantial evidence of their progress towards publication of a peer-reviewed monograph, and departmental recommendations for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor will depend on department members’ confidence that the monograph will appear soon after the decision for tenure and promotion, if it has not already appeared. Such evidence would normally include a completed draft manuscript for members of the department to read, evidence that the manuscript is under consideration at a press, conference or other scholarly presentations on the subject matter of the

monograph, and (if the monograph is not yet published) other peer-reviewed publications based on the candidate's research.

The department expects to see substantial evidence of a candidate's progress towards a peer-reviewed monograph prior to a decision for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, but in the event that the monograph will not be forthcoming prior to or soon after that decision, the department could accept three peer-reviewed scholarly articles as a possible alternative under certain circumstances. In such an event, it is incumbent on the candidate to apprise the department in a timely fashion that the monograph has been delayed (preferably in the context of the fourth-year review described in the Linfield Faculty Handbook IV.6.3, if not before) and to provide a persuasive justification for the submission of three peer-reviewed articles in place of a monograph. The candidate would also be expected to articulate a compelling vision of his or her plans for their future and identity as a historian, bearing in mind that no member of the department may be promoted to Professor without a peer-reviewed monograph.

Candidates for promotion to Professor are expected to have published a peer-reviewed historical monograph (which may appear either before or after the decision for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor) and to provide evidence of continuing scholarly activity and accomplishment since tenure and promotion—please see below for additional details.

History values both single-author and collaborative works. In such cases, the candidate should clarify his/her role in the work, but the mere fact that a publication has multiple authors should not necessarily be weighted less. In addition, History likewise values peer-reviewed publications in related areas, including, but not limited to, matters of pedagogy and curricular design. Finally, History does not distinguish between works that have been published and those that have been accepted for publication.

Review Work and Non-Peer-Reviewed Publications

Review work such as serving as a referee for academic journals and academic presses is an important part of being a professional historian. Being asked to review or referee an article or book manuscript indicates that the candidate has established a strong reputation in their field. Depending on the nature of the work, some of these activities are particularly time-consuming. In addition, non-peer reviewed publications are not subject to external academic review. Writing for non-academic outlets or broader audiences are valued as forms of public history and community engagement.

Substantial Involvement in Professional Organizations

These activities include holding offices or serving on a committee in a professional organization. Such positions are usually by invitation or nomination, thus indicating a candidate's level of engagement and success in his/her field. Since the nature of these activities can vary significantly, it is the candidate's responsibility to clarify what their duties entail and the value of these positions for their own professional development. Serving on editorial boards and award committees or serving in organizational governance positions are examples of such professional achievement.

Participation in Professional Meetings and Conferences

Attending professional meetings, presenting papers at professional conferences, and chairing or participating in roundtable discussions are vital to our profession and to the development of our scholarly ideas and publication process. As such, they are important pieces of our overall professional achievement.

Presentation of Research on Other Campuses

Invitations to present research on other campuses are indications of the strength of the candidate's reputation in their area of expertise.

Achievement of Independent Funding for Research.

Garnering independent funding for research requires undergoing a peer-review process and, if successful, signals recognition of the value of completed and ongoing scholarship.

Undergraduate Research.

While not required for tenure and promotion as our ability to engage undergraduates in meaningful research work varies according to our projects in progress, research with undergraduates is a valued scholarly activity that should be considered professional achievement when disseminated to the public in measurable, concrete ways. It is incumbent upon the candidate to explain why such work should be considered professional achievement versus evidence of teaching effectiveness.

B. Guidelines and Indicators.

The following are common indicators of "meritorious work" and "special merit" (Linfield Faculty Handbook, IV.6.7.4) in professional achievement in History:

- peer-reviewed journal articles including co-authored work
- peer-reviewed chapters in edited volumes, including co-authored work
- peer-reviewed books, including co-authored work
- peer-reviewed edited volumes, including co-edited work
- engagement with non-peer-reviewed work (e.g., publications that draw on scholarly expertise for popular outlets such as magazines, newspapers, and websites; book reviews that draw on scholarly expertise)
- presentation of research at professional conferences
- invitations to present research or relevant expertise at local, state, regional, national, or international levels
- serving as chair or discussant on panels at relevant professional conferences
- meaningful engagement with undergraduate students in collaborative research
- demonstrated efforts to disseminate research to a broader public audience
- clear and compelling path to future professional accomplishment
- achievement of independent funding, or plays a documented role in obtaining funding for individual or collaborative research efforts
- participation in departmental or institutional programming that draws on scholarly expertise
- service as a journal reviewer or editorial board member of respected peer-reviewed outlets
- service as a peer reviewer at regional, national, or international level

- recognition or awards for professional achievement.

C. Summary of Expectations

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor: At the time of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the candidate should be able to provide evidence of substantial progress on a historical monograph (or its equivalent—see section A) and/or have said monograph in hand by the time of promotion and tenure. The candidate should also have other evidence of professional achievement (such as other peer-reviewed publication, conference presentations, etc. – please see Sections A&B above) and have begun to outline how the research trajectory is moving beyond the dissertation.

Promotion to Professor: For promotion to full Professor, our faculty should have published a historical monograph (or its equivalent—see Section A) and should show evidence of an ongoing successful program of professional development. Given that department members will likely be starting new professional projects without the benefits of previous dissertation research, and recognizing that it takes considerable time to conduct historical research properly, we anticipate that the rate of the candidate’s professional output will likely change over time as professional engagement diversifies beyond a narrow focus on peer-reviewed publications. Overall, there should be evidence of greater visibility, recognition, and continued engagement in the candidate’s areas of expertise, thus demonstrating special merit. For example, successful grant applications, elected or leadership roles in professional organizations, or invited presentations can be evidence of greater visibility and recognition. Ongoing evidence of other professional achievements are listed and defined in Sections A & B above.

3. Service

The History Department expects that all members of the department will contribute to the work necessary for the department and university to fulfill their missions.

In the period prior to tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, tenure-track faculty members in the History Department should concentrate on their teaching and professional activity. Departmental recommendations for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor will be made primarily on the basis of a candidate’s teaching and professional achievement, and service beyond the expectations laid out below will not materially affect a candidate’s prospects for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. In particular, untenured members of the department are not required to serve on standing committees of the faculty or in other positions that involve time commitments that might interfere with their development as teachers and scholars.

Candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are expected to have regularly attended department and broader faculty meetings; to have served on any departmental search committees and to have participated seriously and energetically in those searches; to have contributed to events connected with the department’s annual Jonasson Lecture and the activities of its chapter of Phi Alpha Theta, the history honors society for undergraduates; and to have

served as a faculty advisor for first-year students. Other forms of service to the department and university that are appropriate for Assistant Professors (though not required) include participation in search committees for other departments, work with students in the context of student-faculty collaborative grants, service to university programs or interdisciplinary majors related to the candidate's expertise, and service on working groups or ad hoc committees of the faculty or university that do not require substantial time commitments. Teaching in the Linfield Online and Continuing Education (OCE) program shall also be counted as service for courses taught prior to July 1, 2019; after July 1, 2019 OCE teaching should be evaluated as part of a candidate's record of teaching effectiveness. (See Faculty Handbook, IV.6)

Candidates for promotion to Professor are expected to demonstrate a record of substantial service to the department and university in the period since tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Tenured members of the department should continue the forms of service that are expected of Assistant Professors but also move into other positions of service and leadership in the department, college, and university. The forms of service will vary according to the interests of the faculty member and the opportunities available, but appropriate forms of service for Associate Professors include:

- service on standing committees of the faculty, college-wide committees, or university bodies
- service as History Department chair
- service as chair of a standing committee of the faculty
- service in working groups, ad hoc committees, or other faculty, college, or university-wide positions or bodies that involve substantial time commitments and opportunities for leadership

Though the department does not prescribe the forms or quantity of service expected of Associate Professors working towards promotion to Professor, it is unlikely that service on a single standing committee of the faculty, working group, or other body would itself constitute a sufficient record of service for promotion. The department would normally expect a candidate for promotion to Professor to have chaired the department, to have chaired a standing committee of the faculty or college-wide committee, to have served on the University Senate, or to have served in some other position of significant leadership and responsibility.

The department also welcomes service in positions beyond the college that contribute to the discipline of history, raise awareness about the work of historians, or engage students and the larger public in questions related to the past.

The following are common indicators of "meritorious work" and "special merit" (Linfield Faculty Handbook, IV.6.7.4) in service:

- a) Provision of consistent and effective service to department
- b) Provision of consistent and effective service to the institution (extensive service at the institutional level is not expected for promotion to Associate Professor)
- c) Receiving positive evaluation of service activities from Department head (and, if applicable, chair of relevant committee, Senate head, working group, etc.)

- d) Participation in programming that enhances the intellectual life of the college (e.g. Jonasson Lecture, faculty learning communities, etc.)

**Linfield History Department
P&T Guidelines Draft
Peer Institution Procedures and Standards
Submitted to P&T Committee 3.1.21**

The correspondence and related documentation listed below was solicited from a number of peer-institutions in 2015-2016. I have removed the specific names of the then departmental chairs for privacy reasons. We used this feedback and information from the American Historical Association and the Organization of American Historians as we drafted our proposed guidelines. We would have submitted this draft much earlier in this process if it had not been for the illness and death of our colleague Scott Smith and our desire to engage his replacement with the conversations we had been having on P&T matters.

1) Chair, Department of History, University of Puget Sound (10/10/15)

Dear Scott,

Thanks for your email. I've attached our departmental standards for evaluation of colleagues, which echo those of the university in their emphasis on 'teaching excellence' (and related advising work) as the most important criterion for advancement. For tenure, the second most important factor is professional development, followed by service; for promotion to full professor, the second most important factor after teaching is 'distinguished service,' followed by professional development.

You'll see that like many institutions, our expectations for tenure and promotion are somewhat vaguely defined. While the last major overhaul of these guidelines predates my arrival at the university, my understanding is that we in the History Dept. have not wanted to be too prescriptive because we want to be able to grant tenure and promotion to colleagues who may, for example, be excellent teachers and dedicated university servants but have not gotten a monograph out by their sixth year. (Conversely, at some point we might want to deny tenure or promotion to a colleague who was a stellar scholar but didn't care about teaching or service – although such a case hasn't come up in our department during my decade at the university.) During my time here, including 2.5 years as chairperson, I've participated in 4 tenure decisions (all for candidates who received tenure), and 3 of these candidates had monographs in print or under contract by the time of the tenure review, while the fourth had a completed manuscript as well as published articles. As a department we have agreed not to insist that junior colleagues publish a monograph in order to receive tenure, but expect that those who have not published a monograph will have been active scholars and be able to demonstrate this via some combination of published articles, essays in collections, reviews, conference presentations, editorial work, etc. For example, we would likely accept 3 articles plus assorted reviews and conference papers in lieu of a monograph. In part this decision reflects our recognition that the process of researching, writing, and publishing a monograph may look very different depending on colleagues' historical specialization. We are also aware of the more general ratcheting up of publication expectations for tenure within American academia in the past few decades, and want to be realistic about what we can expect from junior colleagues who

often come to us without much teaching or service experience and are expected to teach a 3/3 load (generally consisting of 6 different courses per year) while advising students, supervising independent research projects and the like, and serving on university committees.

As at Linfield, we have a standing committee with rotating membership that reviews all tenure and promotion cases, once these have gone through the departmental review process. Faculty members serving on this committee – the Faculty Advancement Committee – recuse themselves when the committee considers the dossiers of faculty from their home departments, but the home departments' recommendations carry a great deal of weight. The FAC might ask a department chair to clarify a particular judgement, but in my experience the FAC has never ruled against a department by denying tenure/promotion to a faculty member who had been received a positive recommendation from their home department.

I hope this addresses your questions. Best of luck with your project!

Best,
xxx

2) Chair, Department of History, Pacific Lutheran University (10/17/15)

Hi Scott,

Sorry about the delay in getting back to you on your query. And I'm afraid that what I'm going to contribute isn't going to be terribly much use. Expect perhaps to confirm that your project for more clarity is a good and needed one!

We also have a campus-wide committee that makes tenure and promotion recommendations to the administration, and they too have never been particularly clear about amount of publications required - for tenure or promotion to associate (these are separate decisions at PLU), or to full professor. This is in part because of a reluctance to declare, for example, that 4 articles in History equals 2 published musical compositions - or whatever. What this has meant in practice is that each department has largely been able to draw the parameters of what is an acceptable level of publication, and _usually_ the committee follows that lead. I'm sure that there would be real advantages to having a clearer sense of 'what counts' but, this way, the applicant, with the support of their department, can explain why their discipline is article rather than book oriented (for example). And, I suppose, people have appreciated that flexibility - and there haven't been too much controversy (especially at the full professor level). As far as I've been able to discern, for our department, the promotion to full professor is connected to excellent achievement in teaching, research, and service. What that has meant practically, for scholarship is that most who reach full professor have a couple books already out. (There was at least one exception to this - active publications but no book, but I was told, shortly after I came to PLU, that that case shouldn't be taken as a precedent.)

I'm not sure any of this is really going to help your (admirable) task at Linfield of making things more explicit for candidates, but certainly let me know if you have any questions.

Good luck with the info-gathering! Hopefully everyone else you asked was more prompt than I :) I would be happy to see what you do gather, whenever you have the chance to share it.

best,
xxx

3) Chair, Department of History, Reed College (10/7/15)

Dear Scott,
Hello! It's great to hear from you; I do hope we cross paths someday soon.

Alas, our tenure and promotion process is crazy. Of note: departments have no formal role in the process. All tenure and promotion decisions are made by the campus-wide Committee on Advancement and Tenure (CAT); they receive input from faculty via individual letters. Generally speaking, every member of the department would write an individual letter to the CAT when a colleague in the department comes up for review. This is every other year for junior faculty (with tenure decisions made in the 6th year at the latest), and every four years for tenured faculty. The department chair has no special role in this process -- I just write my own letter. One hopes/presumes that the CAT pays particular attention to letters from departmental colleagues, but that is not required.

As a result, there are no formal "departmental" expectations for advancement. The CAT evaluates for promotion and advancement on three criteria: teaching, scholarship, and service. For the tenure review, outside experts write letters, but otherwise all information is internal. Formally, there is no requirement that "scholarship" involve publication; it only requires "engagement." However, I think it fair to say that over the past decade there is a campus-wide expectation of some publication for tenure, although what that entails is not at all standardized or formalized, and it is still possible to receive tenure with minimal publication.

The History department is one of the college's more academically engaged ones; everyone tenured in the past twelve years either had published a monograph book or had a contract for one that came out shortly thereafter, and I think the current junior faculty will be publishing to that level. One could, perhaps, speak of "departmental expectations" in that members of departments known for publishing might expect tenure candidates to have published, and might reflect that expectation in their letters of support/evaluation; conversely, members of departments that rarely publish might not have such an expectation, which might also be reflected in their letters of support/evaluation. But that is in no way a formal college or departmental requirement, and presumably the CAT attempts to apply a college-wide standard regardless of individual departmental expectations.

As to advancement from Associate to Full, the system works strictly on a ladder (http://www.reed.edu/dean_of_faculty/handbook/2-j-1.html). Rank 47 is Assistant Professor, Rank 49 is Associate, Rank 53 is Full. (Ranks 48 and 52 straddle between Asst/Assoc and Assoc/full). Generally one is promoted one rank every two years; for exceptional merit one can get a two-rank promotion; no advancement is seen as punitive. (Full faculty almost invariably

are moved up one position half-way through their 4-year review cycle, then fully assessed at the 4th year.) Again, the CAT takes into consideration teaching, scholarship, and service (roughly in that order) in deciding whether to move people up 0, 1, or 2 levels. There is no specific publication requirement; there are full professors here who have never published even a book review, and Associate Professors with tenure who have published actively and have national reputations in their fields.

Such, to the best of my understanding, is our idiosyncratic system. I wouldn't advise using it as a model...

Best,

xxx

4) Chair, Department of History, Lewis and Clark (3/16/16)

Dear Scott,

Thanks for your message. We have actually not had a tenure review in our department since 2008 when I was reviewed. I've never served on the CPT so I have no direct experience of the internal workings of the tenure process beyond the departmental level.

The standard for tenure in our department has generally been a monograph or a series of peer-reviewed journal articles already published and substantial progress (broadly defined) on scholarship beyond the dissertation process. For the overall review, teaching excellence and innovation are as important as scholarship. Service to the college and to the academic profession is a distance third to scholarship and teaching.

You might want to contact Bob Mandel (mandel@lclark.edu), Professor of International Affairs, who is currently chair of the CPT. Lewis & Clark is revising and clarifying our procedure and standards for promotion to full professor. He could tell you more about that.

Best regards,

xxx

5) Chair, department of History, Willamette University (3/17/16)

Dear Scott,

Thank you for email and I sympathize with your issues! You've caught me at a bit of a crazy time just before break, so my proposal is to keep my response brief here, and then invite a phone call for more discussion. How does that sound?

Briefly, departments at WU do not vote on tenure, so there is no such thing as a codified standard at the department level, at least for us. Our faculty handbook requires peer-reviewed publication (or equivalent) for promotion and tenure, but relies on representatives of the disciplines to define what acceptable standards are. Tenure is granted by an elected Faculty Council that relies quite

substantially on the external review process for affirmation that a candidate is meeting standards in her/his discipline.

In other words, we have prioritized flexibility and disciplinary-specific criteria. There are issues in communicating this effectively. We employ a variety of means: faculty mentors, frequent Q and A sessions put on by Faculty Council, concrete examples of successful files, etc.

Feel free to give me a call if you'd like more input. I will be back in my office the last week of March. 503-370-6555.

All the best,

xxx

6) Chair, Department of History, University of Redlands (3/20/16)

Scott:

Our process and structure sounds much like yours as you describe it in your first paragraph. We have a weak chair model where everyone in the department writes for review. We've got a 3/3 load/sabbatical can be split before tenure or full year after 7th year/modest development funds. For review, teaching is fundamental and as you know at a small liberal arts college (while Redlands has a School of Education, Music and Business, we reside in the undergraduate college unit), the service load can be significant. So the current scholarship expectations are not onerous and are rather vague. For full, the expectations are not clear at all.

I've been at Redlands for 12 years and I'd say the cohorts that have come in the past 15 years or so have had uniformly higher expectations re: scholarship though that has yet to be reflected in formal policy (this piece of information is confidential). And departmental and programmatic expectations also vary widely. My sense is that the History Department has always had higher standards than the University's with regard to scholarship (also confidential), with the expectation that a monograph (or other significant scholarship) is forthcoming around tenure, but this is not codified: it can't be since the expectations about scholarship reside at the level of College/University policy. I'd say the culture of the Department is that we encourage and support each other in our scholarship and want to remain viable and connected to the profession as a whole as far as presenting and so forth.

In the College we are in the midst of General Education revision so any discussion about tenure and promotion and standards for scholarship would have to wait: I'd also say that we rarely have controversial cases so it is not pressing.

Hope this helps. And yes I'd be interested in any information you've gathered that you are willing to share.

Best,

xxx

7) Chair, Department of History, Whitman College (4/5/16)

Hi Scott,

Forgive my delay in responding. You caught me at a particularly busy time.

A few years ago, each department at Whitman was asked to draw up discipline-specific guidelines for tenure and promotion. There is no department on campus that requires a book for tenure, though it is becoming more common for faculty to publish a monograph.

In history, we require either a series of articles (with no specific number), or a book. We also accept a book contract or manuscript evaluated by outside readers along with at least one article. The reasoning for the latter is that since the book has not yet been published, we need to see at least one article (or book chapter) showing that the candidate's work is indeed publishable. We do require a book for promotion from associate professor to professor. But that book may have been produced for tenure. We expect continued scholarship, but not necessarily a second book. We are the only department on campus that requires a book, and that is for promotion to professor. However, there is only one tenured member of the department who has not produced a monograph or have one forthcoming. (Eight of us are tenured; of the two pre-tenure department members, one already has a book contract.)

We shifted to a five-course load from six about seven years ago. But even with the lower load, the demands of teaching and service are high. A faculty workload survey before the change showed that faculty worked on average 60 hours a week. With the reduced load, I think faculty work 60 hours during the three-class semester and 40 during the two-class session. In other words, the class reduction does not really provide much time for more scholarship being produced during the semester.

We are currently reviewing tenure and promotion guidelines with special emphasis on the clarity of wording of requirements, with extra focus on new publishing venues, how to evaluate articles focused on pedagogy vs. research in our disciplines, and how to define and evaluate service. We are also concerned with diversity and inclusion as part of this process.

I think it is essential that faculty and administrators at institutions like ours realize that we are not research universities. We believe strongly in the teacher-scholar model, and scholarship certainly informs our teaching as well as providing opportunities for students to work with us. As such, scholarship matters. But the level of teaching, service, and accessibility to students means that we will never be able to produce on the same level as our university-based colleagues.

Given that so many of us have published monographs, there is certainly an atmosphere on campus in which junior faculty feel pressure to produce a book. That anxiety has not been relieved by our repeated assurances that a book is not required.

I hope this information does not come too late to be of use.

Best,
xxx

8) Response from Chair, Augsburg College, St. Paul, MN History Department Statement on Scholarship (2016):

Department of History Statement on Scholarship

Unlike most academic disciplines, history has always served lay as well as scholarly audiences. Even so, over the last fifty years, most history departments prioritized scholarship for fellow academic historians over work done for a broader public. More recently, the profession began to recognize the need to recover a more complicated stance toward scholarship, one that not only values books, articles, and presentations for fellow academics but also acknowledges the work produced for public audiences.

Given Augsburg College's tradition of civic engagement, the department is well positioned to embrace this innovative approach. We commend this recent trend in our profession and intentionally adopt its precepts. For instance, the American Historical Association's "Statement on Standards of Professional Conduct" (2005), defines scholarship as follows:

Membership in this profession is defined by self-conscious identification with a community of historians who are collectively engaged in investigating and interpreting the past as a matter of disciplined learned practice. Historians work in an extraordinary range of settings: in museums and libraries and government agencies, in schools and academic institutions, in corporations and non-profit organizations. Some earn their living primarily from employment related to the past; some practice history while supporting themselves in other ways. Whatever the venue in which they work, though, professional historians share certain core values that guide their activities and inform their judgments as they seek to enrich our collective understanding of the past. These shared values for conducting and assessing research, developing and evaluating interpretations, communicating new knowledge, navigating ethical dilemmas, and, not least, telling stories about the past, define the professional practice of history...

Historians should practice their craft with integrity. They should honor the historical record. They should document their sources. They should acknowledge their debts to the work of other scholars. They should respect and welcome divergent points of view even as they argue and subject those views to critical scrutiny. They should remember that our collective enterprise depends on mutual trust. And they should never betray that trust.

Scholarship—the discovery, exchange, interpretation, and presentation of information about the past—is basic to the professional practice of history. It depends on the collection and preservation of historical documents, artifacts, and other source materials in a variety of institutional settings ranging from libraries to archives to museums to government agencies to private organizations. Historians are committed to protecting

significant historical evidence wherever it resides. Scholarship likewise depends on the open dissemination of historical knowledge via many different channels of communication: books, articles, classrooms, exhibits, films, historic sites, museums, legal memoranda, testimony, and many other ways. The free exchange of information about the past is dear to historians.¹

With this definition in mind, department recognizes that public historians working in academic history departments often require a more expansive understanding of scholarship than the production of books and articles for fellow academics. A recent working group on evaluating public history scholarship sponsored by the American Historical Association, the National Council on Public History, and the Organization of American Historians noted that public historians' "professional work differs from 'traditional' historical research not in method or in rigor but in the venues in which it is presented and in the collaborative nature of its creation. Public history scholarship, like all good historical scholarship, is peer reviewed, but that review includes a broader and more diverse group of peers, many from outside traditional academic departments, working in museums, historic sites, and other sites of mediation between scholars and the public."²

Finally, the Department is open and sympathetic to colleagues whose scholarly output is affected by affirmed decisions to slow down or stop their tenure and promotion "clock," especially at times of personal exigency, according to College policies.

All told, the Department of History at Augsburg College values the past. It encourages scholarship that portrays and interprets the past on its own terms, that follows the evidence wherever it may lead, that is presented to an audience, and that represents a process as much as a product.

Scholarship Recognized and Encouraged by the Department of History

The department values and encourages scholarship that reflects the highest standards of the profession and discipline. Evidence of a record of scholarly distinction will be established by the candidate's body of work. It should be of high quality and recognized for its significance within the candidate's field of research or creative work. Specifically, we value scholarship that is available to an **audience**, that results in a **product**, that demonstrates **expertise**, that is subject to **review**, and that is **creative, original, and complex**.

Availability to an audience should be understood to include print and electronic publication,

¹ *Statement on Standards of Professional Conduct*, approved by Professional Division, December 9, 2004 and adopted by Council, January 6, 2005, section 3. See <http://www.historians.org/pubs/Free/ProfessionalStandards.cfm#Scholarship>

² "Tenure, Promotion, and the Publicly-Engaged Academic Historian," Working Group on Evaluating Public History Scholarship (sponsored by the AHA, OAH, and NCPH), September 2010, available at <http://www.historians.org/publications-and-directories/perspectives-on-history/september-2010/tenure-promotion-and-the-publicly-engaged-academic-historian-a-report>

audio and video recording, digital media, and live presentation, reading, or exhibition. The lists below offer a range of forms that historical scholarship may take.

Forms of **scholarship** that may fulfill these standards include:

Writing and/or presenting research products to disciplinary and academic audiences such as:

- Single author peer-reviewed books based on original research
- Single or co-authored peer-reviewed books based on synthetic research
- Edited peer-reviewed books with essays by multiple contributors
- Peer-reviewed journal articles and book chapters based on original research
- Peer-reviewed conference papers and panel presentations
- Peer-reviewed poster presentations at academic conferences
- Invited scholarly lectures, conference papers, and panel presentations
- Invited entries in scholarly reference works
- Translations and edited primary sources
- Seminars and workshops for disciplinary audiences

Contributions to the scholar's disciplinary and professional communities, such as:

- Invited book reviews for scholarly journals
- Peer reviews of book manuscripts for scholarly publishers
- Peer reviews of article manuscripts for scholarly journals
- Peer reviews of academic textbooks for publishers
- Responses to published and peer reviews of the candidate's own work
- New majors, specialty tracks within a major, and minors
- Courses (in creation, development, and revision)
- Program evaluations for the college
- Program evaluations for outside institutions
- Studies done for the college
- General education programs, subprograms, and tools
- Skills assessment programs and tools
- Grants written for college programs and projects

Contributing expertise to scholarly projects in roles such as:

- Editing a professional or scholarly journal
- Serving on the editorial board of a publisher, journal, or book series
- Organizing conferences, panels, and workshops
- Service on award committees for disciplinary associations
- Chairing a panel or session at a scholarly conference
- Organizing a reading series or film series
- Serving on boards of professional organizations
- Organizing and presenting workshops for the college community

Contributing expertise to public history projects in roles such as (but not limited to):

- Grant-funded historical work for broader audiences
- Museum and exhibit consultation
- Creating digital media content related to one's field of expertise
- Oral history projects
- K-12 teacher education initiatives
- Creating interpretive plans for historic sites
- Advising historical documentary projects
- Nominating properties to the National Historic Register

The central characteristic that binds these diverse activities together is peer-review. In cases where scholarship targets non-academic audiences, grant approval or collaboration and consultation with professional historians working outside of academic departments constitutes peer-review.

Scholarship may be supplemented by writing and presentations to a broader public such as, media columns and opinion pieces, news stories and features, interviews by journalists, articles in college publications, seminars for nonprofessional audiences, and participation in community conferences, symposia, and discussions. These specific activities provide evidence of expertise, but do not involve peer-review. They are considered scholarly activity, but not scholarship.

Criteria for Excellence in Scholarship for the Department of History

The faculty of the Department of History at Augsburg College aspires to excellence in scholarship. Total scholarly productivity in any given period should include a reasonable amount of work that includes an accounting of teaching load and research support provided by the College.

As the American Historical Association suggests, excellence in scholarship involves the following elements:

- Discovery: The department values creative contributions to the discipline. Discovery can range from original research and analysis rooted in primary-source research on the one hand to synthetic contributions drawing from significant numbers of secondary sources on the other.
- Interpretation: The department values historical scholarship that displays knowledge and ongoing learning about specific subject matter, is rooted in historical methods (broadly defined), and follows recognized professional practice. Interpretations can range from the production of narratives about the past that offer new insights and advance the collective knowledge of the subject to those that collate and combine existing knowledge in new ways.
- Presentation and Exchange: The department encourages the vigorous exchange of ideas and embraces a broad range of forms of presentation. But it especially values the written word (in any number of formats). Presentations can range from books, articles, and

essays (published or digital) on the one hand to conference papers, invited lectures, speeches, and performances on the other.

In cases of tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review, the department's letter of nomination (as well as supporting letters written within the department) will use the above guidelines to provide more specific characterizations of a candidate's or colleague's scholarship.