

CRITERIA FOR TENURE, PROMOTION TO ACADEMIC RANKS, AND POST PROFESSORIAL MERIT

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY AND ANTHROPOLOGY

This tenure, promotion and post professorial merit criteria document has two purposes: 1) To serve department, college, and university committees which review tenure, promotion and post professorial merit materials and evaluate applicants; 2) To provide guidance to faculty members in setting appropriate priorities for their professional activities.

Candidates will be rated in each of three major categories:

- 1) TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS,
- 2) PROFESSIONAL GROWTH,
- 3) SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY,

using the following scale: Outstanding, Superior, Good, or Unacceptable.

Instructions to Reviewers of Merit, Tenure and Promotion Materials:

Ratings required for advancement

Professor and Post-Professorial Merit	One rating of outstanding and two ratings of superior
Associate Professor and Tenure	Superior or above in TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS and PROFESSIONAL GROWTH and a rating of good or above in SERVICE

TENURE:

CANDIDATES FOR TENURE ARE EXPECTED TO MEET OR EXCEED THE MINIMUM PERFORMANCE LEVELS SET FORTH FOR THE RANK OF ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR.

Following are definitions of these terms as used in the criteria:

Achievement: a single instance (e.g. revision of one course, one publication, leadership on one committee for one year).

Sustained: the record documents a level of performance in a category (Teaching Effectiveness, Professional Development, Service to the University) over a period of time in rank, emphasizing the last four years in rank. Sustained does NOT mean “continuous” or without breaks.

Approved Department: 10/28/2021
Approved CHSS Tenure & Promotion Committee: 11/04/2021
Approved Dean CHSS: 11/09/2021
Approved University Committee: 11/12/2021
Approved Provost: 11/15/2021

Quality: ascertaining the level of quality assigned to achievements (e.g., “very high” or “high”) in Teaching Effectiveness, Professional Growth, and Service to the University is based on the professional judgment of departmental peers and is grounded in such professional standards as level and rigor of peer review, the significance and impact of the work, and degree of effort required.

Quality Teaching Performance is defined as a record of positive student and peer evaluations indicating effective teaching at the time of advancement, with the expectation of its continuance.

In the areas of Teaching Effectiveness outside of Teaching Performance the department assesses quality based on the significance and impact of the work and on the degree of effort required.

In the area of Professional Growth, the department assesses quality for all faculty around a similar set of criteria: 1) a work’s contribution to or impact in the field, shown through reviews, citations, honors and awards, or other evidence, 2) success in broadening appreciation for or knowledge in the field by transmitting current scholarship to specialist or non-specialist audiences, 3) the candidate’s explanation of the importance of the candidate’s work, 4) the comments of outside reviewers of the work, and 5) the Committee’s own assessment of the candidate’s work. *Note: In many instances, the best judge of the quality or significance of a candidate’s scholarly work will be peers from outside the department and therefore candidates are encouraged to provide reviews, outside letters and other evidence of this type to the committee.*

In Service to the University the department assesses quality based on the significance and impact of the work and on the degree of effort required.

Note: the definitions provided here for terms are intended to aid in guiding faculty toward success in their applications for promotion and to provide guidance to reviewers. It is not the intent of this document, nor is it possible, to provide criteria so complete and explicit as to obviate the need for the exercise of judgement in their interpretation. Nothing in this document may contradict any provisions of the Faculty Handbook, and if any contradictions occur, the Faculty Handbook takes precedence.

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

Evidence Demonstrating Teaching Effectiveness

The candidate should provide a self-evaluation in the area of teaching, including a statement of general teaching philosophy and teaching effectiveness.

- I. Teaching Performance - *A recommendation for advancement requires that actual teaching at time of review must be demonstrably acceptable and logically expected to continue to be. Evidence of a sustained record requires that evidence of teaching effectiveness be collected over the entire period in rank.*
 - A. Colleagues' Evaluations
 - B. Student Evaluations
 - C. Student Testimonials *Indicate whether solicited or unsolicited*
 - D. Student Performance and Success
 - E. Other Evidence
- II. Successful Efforts to Raise Own Teaching Competency (*e.g., participation in teaching workshops, etc.*)
- III. Additional Teaching Responsibilities
 - A. Independent Studies, Student Research, and Theses
 - B. Student Advising or Mentoring
 - C. Supervision of Graduate Assistants
 - D. Additional Teaching Load Consideration
 - E. Other Evidence
- IV. Curriculum Maintenance and Development
 - A. Program Development
 - B. Reorganization and Innovation in Courses for Which the Candidate has Primary Responsibility
 1. Development of a new course, including teaching a departmentally established course for the first time.
 2. Development of a new course offering under an umbrella syllabus (e.g., Topics in World History).
 3. Major revision of an existing course in which a revised formal course syllabus is approved in the regular curricular process.
 4. Development of a significant new component for an existing course such as a major revision (e.g., computer applications).

- C. Obtaining Support for Improvement of Teaching
 - 1. Grants. (indicate whether internal or external).
 - 2. Donations or Other External Support for Teaching.
 - 3. Other Evidence.
 - D. Other Evidence
- V. Recognition of Teaching Effectiveness by Peers External to the Department
- A. Winning of Pedagogical Grants from Peer Reviewed Programs
 - B. External Recognition
 - C. Other Evidence

PERFORMANCE LEVELS FOR TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

- Outstanding:** An evaluation of Outstanding requires a record of sustained, very high-quality teaching supported by well-documented high-quality achievements in I (Teaching Performance). In addition, the record should demonstrate five (5) well-documented high-quality achievements in at least three (3) of the categories II through V listed above. (See above for definition of high-quality)
- Superior:** An evaluation of Superior requires a record of sustained, high-quality teaching supported by well-documented high-quality achievements in I (Teaching Performance). In addition, the record should demonstrate three (3) well-documented high-quality achievements in at least two (2) of the categories II through V listed above.
- Good:** An evaluation of Good requires a record of sustained, high-quality teaching supported by well-documented high-quality achievements in I (Teaching Performance). In addition, the record should demonstrate two (2) well-documented high-quality achievements in at least one (1) of the categories II through V listed above.
- Unacceptable:** An evaluation of Unacceptable results when there is insufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness.

PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

Evidence Demonstrating Professional Growth

The candidate should provide a self-evaluation in the area of Professional Growth, including a statement of general professional growth and scholarly effectiveness.

I. Scholarship –

- A. Professional Publication – *Candidates and reviewers should reference the appendix for clarification on the department's perspective about what constitutes appropriate scholarly activity for professional publication.*
1. Publication of a peer-reviewed book authored.
 2. Peer-reviewed articles in journals and chapters in books.
 3. Editorship of a peer-reviewed book or journal.
 4. Preparation of a National Register of Historic Places nomination approved at the federal level.
 5. Professional public history, anthropology, or geography projects, such as exhibits, interpretive materials/guides, maps; open archaeological, ethnographic, linguistic, or geospatial data projects; translations, digital history and archival collection projects.
 6. Preparation of a major report, such as an interpretive plan, archaeological site report; forensic, ethnographic, geographic, or cultural resources report; historic structures report, archival finding aid, preservation plan, acquisitions or collections management policy, national accreditation report, or similar professional publication.
 7. Successful applications for external grants.
 8. Other peer-reviewed publication.
- B. Other Professional Publication
1. Non-peer-reviewed book.
 2. Non-peer-reviewed article.
 3. Editorship of non-peer-reviewed book or journal.
 4. Publication of encyclopedia and dictionary entries.
 5. Publication of book reviews.
 6. Peer-reviewed or refereed book under contract.
 7. Other non-peer-reviewed professional publication.
- C. Professional Presentation and Other Scholarly Endeavor - *An active program of professional presentations or grant applications indicates that a candidate has a sustained program of professional growth.*
1. Presentation at professional conferences, meetings, or other scholarly venues. *Indicate level: international, national, regional, or state.*
 2. Successful applications for internal grants.
 3. Review of manuscripts for publication or review of articles for scholarly journals.

4. Organizing a themed or topical symposium, organized session, sponsored session, or invited session at a professional meeting.
 5. Advanced professional study through participation in seminars, forums, institutes, and workshops.
 6. Applying for external grants.
 7. Other scholarly activity.
- D. Ongoing Research and Scholarly Activity - *Evidence presented in only this section will be insufficient to document acceptable achievement in Category I: Scholarship.*
- II. Service to the Profession - *Performance ratings better than GOOD require more than simple membership in professional organizations.*
- A. Holding office, chairing a committee or taskforce, or serving on same
 - B. Serving as webmaster or editor of a newsletter
 - C. Serving as discussant or commentator at a professional meeting
 - D. Chairing sessions at professional meetings
 - E. Attendance at professional meetings
 - F. Other service which should be described fully by the candidate
- III. Recognition of Peers - *To receive a rating of Outstanding in Professional Growth, candidates must demonstrate that peers external to the university recognize the value and importance of their scholarly achievements.*
- A. External Peers - *The candidate seeking an evaluation of Outstanding must include at least one letter from a colleague who can and will speak frankly about the quality and significance of the candidate's scholarship. Note to reviewers: Much of the applicable evidence in this category will already be cited earlier in this section when discussing publications and presentations, or may be included in the letters of support for advancement provided by the candidate, and may be cross-referenced here.*
 - B. Peers within the University

PERFORMANCE LEVELS FOR PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

Outstanding: An evaluation of OUTSTANDING requires a record of sustained, very high-quality scholarship resulting in professional publication and

presentation. The record should demonstrate either one (1) well documented high-quality achievement in IA1 or three (3) well documented high-quality achievements in IA 2-8, one (1) of which must come from IA2. In addition, the record must demonstrate five (5) well documented high-quality achievements in categories IB, IC or II listed above. There must be evidence of recognition of the candidate's scholarship at the national level supported by evidence in III above.

- Superior: An evaluation of SUPERIOR requires a record of sustained high-quality scholarship resulting in professional publication and presentation. The record should demonstrate two (2) well documented high-quality achievements in IA 2-8, one (1) of which must come from IA2. In addition, the record must demonstrate four (4) well documented high-quality achievements in categories IB, IC or II listed above. Evidence of recognition of the candidate's scholarship beyond the departmental level supported by evidence in III above will strengthen the candidate's dossier.
- Good: An evaluation of GOOD requires a record of high-quality scholarship resulting in professional publication and presentation. The record should demonstrate one (1) well documented high-quality achievement in IA 2. In addition, the record must demonstrate three (3) well documented high-quality achievements in categories IB, IC or II listed above.
- Unacceptable: An evaluation of Unacceptable results when there is insufficient evidence of quality scholarship resulting in professional publication and presentation.

SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY

Evidence Demonstrating Service to the University

The candidate should provide a self-evaluation in the area of Service to Department, College, University, and Community including a statement of general professional outreach philosophy and outreach effectiveness.

- I. Contributions to Student Activities
 - A. Student Advising or Mentoring
 - B. Recruitment of Students
 - C. Placement of Graduates
 - D. Support of Extracurricular Professional Activities
 1. Serving as advisor to a student professional organization.

2. Leading extra-curricular field trips.
3. Presenting programs in areas of specialization to faculty and student groups.

E. Other Evidence

II. Service to Internal Functioning of the University

A. Service on Committees and Councils - Ratings better than Good in Service to the University will require some service on committees and councils above the department level.

1. Chairperson of Faculty Senate, or university or college committees.
2. Department chair, director or assistant director of a center, director or assistant director of the university museum, coordinator of the historic preservation program, B.A. advisor, social studies advisor, or graduate coordinator.
3. For example, but not limited to: Member of Faculty Senate, Academic Council, Graduate Council, General Education Council, or College Council.
4. Member of a university committee or college committee.
5. Chair of departmental committee.
6. Member of departmental committee.

B. Other Service to Internal Functioning of the University

1. Completing university, college, or departmental assignments and voluntary actions not handled by committee, e.g., department Library Liaison; History Day Coordinator.
2. Serving as an advisor to campus-wide non-programmatic student organizations.

C. Other Evidence

III. Service to the Public - Only public service activities which candidates perform in their capacity as a representative of the department are appropriately included herein as evidence.

A. Professional Service

B. Consultation

C. Professional Presentations intended for lay audiences

D. Service to Schools

E. Service or Outreach Grants

F. Other Evidence

PERFORMANCE LEVELS FOR SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY

- Outstanding:** An evaluation of Outstanding requires a record of sustained, very high-quality service. The record must demonstrate eight (8) well-documented high-quality achievements in I through III, at least three (3) of which must come from II, including evidence of participation in the university governance structure above the department level.
- Superior:** An evaluation of Superior requires a record of sustained high-quality service. The record must demonstrate six (6) well-documented high-quality achievements in I through III, at least two (2) of which must come from II.
- Good:** An evaluation of Good requires a record of high-quality service to the department. The record must demonstrate four (4) well-documented high-quality achievements in I through III, at least one (1) of which must come from II.
- Unacceptable:** An evaluation of Unacceptable results when there is insufficient evidence of quality service to the University.

Appendix

Notes for candidates and reviewers regarding Professional Growth in the Department of History and Anthropology

Scholarship - the American Historical Association's (AHA) *Statement on Standards of Professional Conduct* defines scholarship as **the discovery, exchange, interpretation, and presentation of information about the past.**¹ The AHA's 1993 report, *Redefining Historical Scholarship*, describes historical scholarship as being composed of "four distinct yet interrelated components:

- The advancement of knowledge--essentially original research
- The integration of knowledge--synthesizing and reintegrating knowledge, revealing new patterns of meaning and new relationships between the parts and the whole
- The application of knowledge--professional practice directly related to an individual's scholarly specialization
- The transformation of knowledge through teaching--including pedagogical content knowledge and discipline-specific educational theory"²

The American Anthropological Association (AAA) defines scholarship similarly, indicating the "four areas of knowledge production to which scholarship should contribute" are:

- the scholarship of discovery: new ways of knowing
- the scholarship of integration: cross- and inter-disciplinarity
- the scholarship of application: connections to everyday life and social structures
- the scholarship of teaching: anthropological pedagogy³

Although the American Association of Geographers has not produced the type of tenure and promotion documents developed by the AHA or AAA, its emphasis on inter- and multidisciplinary projects to "bridge the gap between teaching and research through reflection and rigorous research methods" and its desire to "advance the scholarship of teaching and learning across the entire discipline," helping geography faculty address "the important issues of diversity & inclusion, public outreach, science advocacy, communication skills, work/life balance, [and] the tenure/promotion process" suggests a similar outlook and perspective on what constitutes appropriate scholarship for geography faculty.⁴

¹ <https://www.historians.org/jobs-and-professional-development/statements-and-standards-of-the-profession/statement-on-standards-of-professional-conduct> (accessed 03/09/19).

² <http://www.historians.org/about-aha-and-membership/aha-history-and-archives/archives/redefining-historical-scholarship> accessed 03/09/19.

³ American Anthropological Association Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion Review: Communicating Public Scholarship in Anthropology, posted May 1, 2017 (<http://s3.amazonaws.com/rdcms-aaa/files/production/public/AAA%20Guidelines%20TP%20Communicating%20Forms%20of%20Public%20Anthropology.pdf> accessed 03/09/19).

⁴ http://www.aag.org/cs/education/academic_departments_and_faculty_development/carnegie_academy_for_the_scholarship_of_teaching_and_learning_castl and <http://www.aag.org/gfda>, accessed 03/09/19.

Acknowledging that departmental faculty are frequently engaged in the advancement of knowledge or the scholarship of discovery, the department also recognizes that scholarship falls within all four areas. Public history scholarship in general, and public historians in particular, although contributing to all four areas often engage in the application of knowledge more fully and consistently than their more academic colleagues. Likewise, our Social Studies colleagues also contribute in all four areas but may focus more on the transformation of knowledge through teaching. The same would be true for our Anthropology, Geography and Social Science colleagues. The AAA notes that “Anthropologists who engage in public forms of writing, publishing, and communicating anthropology make valuable scholarly contributions to the discipline.”⁵ As such, these criteria try to take into account the variety of scholarship produced by the members of the department, and the varying forms of dissemination and peer review they may undergo. Another difference between academic scholarship as it has been traditionally practiced and scholarship in the twenty-first century is the increased potential for collaborative work. Public history is inherently collaborative, and increasingly academic historians, anthropologists, geographers and social scientists are finding themselves involved in inter- and multi-disciplinary scholarly activities.⁶

A recommendation for advancement requires that candidates must be active scholars in their avowed specialties as evidenced by a sustained record of achievement in Professional Growth. Candidates must indicate in their self-evaluation how their scholarly activity and professional publication(s) are related to their avowed specialty and how their avowed specialty advances the goals and objectives of the department.

Professional Publication - Papers accepted and "in press" are considered equivalent to publications (indicate "in press" in document). *Papers "in review" or "under contract" are not "in press"*. The candidate should recognize that a recommendation for advancement requires publication. Publications are of differing types and qualities. The final evaluation of the quality and significance of publications will be done by committees. Complexity, peer review, significance of conclusions, and contribution to the field in terms of impact and audience reached are some factors that will be considered. Reviewers should be aware that publication length can

⁵ AAA Guidelines, p. 2.

⁶ These criteria incorporate the perspectives offered by the Report “Tenure, Promotion, and the Publicly Engaged Academic Historian: A White Paper,” by the Working Group on Evaluating Public History Scholarship, the American Historical Association’s “Guidelines for the Professional Evaluation of Digital Scholarship by Historians,” and the “American Anthropological Association Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion Review: Communicating Public Scholarship in Anthropology” to ensure the work of our colleagues is fairly evaluated and properly rewarded. “Tenure, Promotion, and the Publicly Engaged Academic Historian: A White Paper,” by the Working Group on Evaluating Public History Scholarship (<http://ncph.org/cms/wp-content/uploads/2010/06/Engaged-Historian-White-Paper-FINAL1.pdf>) (accessed 03/09/19), the American Historical Association’s “Guidelines for the Professional Evaluation of Digital Scholarship by Historians” (<https://www.historians.org/teaching-and-learning/digital-history-resources/evaluation-of-digital-scholarship-in-history/guidelines-for-the-professional-evaluation-of-digital-scholarship-by-historians>) (accessed 03/09/19), and the “American Anthropological Association Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion Review: Communicating Public Scholarship in Anthropology” (<http://s3.amazonaws.com/rdcms-aaa/files/production/public/AAA%20Guidelines%20TP%20Communicating%20Forms%20of%20Public%20Anthropology.pdf>) (accessed 03/09/19).

vary by subdiscipline within the department; for example, articles in forensics journals and some public history outlets are short compared to other traditional academic journals. Each publication will be evaluated within the context of its disciplinary focus. The department supports the finding of the working group on evaluating public history scholarship that the scholarly work of public historians “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 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.”⁷ The same is true for public scholarship in Anthropology, Geography and Social Science. Review of public anthropology or geography projects by external communities such as Tribal Councils, community organizations, government representatives, etc. may be appropriate and should be considered as constituting a valid form of peer review.⁸ Reviewers should also note that post-publication peer review is common in public scholarship and is appropriate evidence to support a finding of high or very high quality for these types of projects.⁹ Candidates should include copies or other evidence where appropriate and explain the significance of their work in their materials. Recognizing that in some cases a body of work may have more significance than the individual elements considered separately, significant effort at the local or regional level evidenced by two or more high quality achievements of more limited scope may be combined to equal one very high quality achievement for purposes of meeting the requirements for achievement in Professional Growth IA. Likewise, a single achievement may be of such high quality and significance in terms of its contribution to or impact in the field that departmental reviewers may conclude it represents more than a single achievement for the purposes of meeting the requirements for advancement in Professional Growth IA.

The White Paper on Tenure, Promotion and the Publicly Engaged Historian makes a best practice recommendation that “serving as the lead developer on a major exhibition can legitimately be seen as equivalent to authoring a book; a somewhat more modest exhibit may be akin to an article. The distinction depends on the exhibition’s scope and originality, its depth of original research, the array of sources it draws upon, its size, the diversity and elaborateness of exhibit components, and the project’s impact on its audiences” (p. 17). Similar analysis of the quality of any scholarly work included in this category can be made regardless of format of presentation. Candidates should explain the nature and significance of the project, the level and rigor of peer review, and the contribution to the field in terms of impact and audience reached.

Reviewers should note that post-publication peer review is common in public scholarship and is appropriate evidence to support a finding of high or very high quality for these types of projects.¹⁰

⁷ Tenure, Promotion and the Publicly Engaged Historian.

⁸ AAA Guidelines.

⁹ See “Best Practices in Public History: Establishing and Developing a Public History Program,” prepared by the National Council for Public History.

¹⁰ “Best Practices in Public History” and AAA Guidelines.