

CRITERIA FOR THE  
ANNUAL EVALUATION OF FULL-TIME FACULTY MEMBERS  
OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

Adopted by the Department  
January 22, 2003

The Department Affairs Committee (DAC) will assess the work of full-time tenured and tenure track faculty on the basis of the work distribution outlined in each faculty member's Total Workload Report Form for the three-year period under evaluation.

Because the Department of History is a Ph.D. granting department, it expects its full-time faculty members to be active in the three areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. Therefore, faculty members shall choose some variant of workload option 1 or workload option 3. Exceptions may be made for faculty members who have significant administrative duties which bring them under the direct supervision of the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and who have received permission from the Dean to adopt a workload distribution that does not fall into category 1, 2, or 3.

The DAC will assess each faculty member's three-year record of scholarship, teaching, and service in light of the following considerations:

1. Evaluation of scholarship will consider the quality of a faculty member's published research and work in progress including:

- a. Research monographs (peer-reviewed books) that are the product of substantial research based on primary sources. (Because a research monograph requires years of research and writing, such books will be counted for five years beginning with the year of publication.)
- b. Edited books involving significant primary research; major works of synthesis such as textbooks; research articles and book chapters based on scholarly research; anthologies and readers. (Items in this category are not listed in any rank order of importance. Each will be considered as having secondary importance only to a research monograph. However, any book-length item in this category that is reviewed in a scholarly journal may be submitted for consideration during the fourth and fifth years after its publication.)
- c. Digital scholarship: Scholarship of the varieties described in items a., b., d., and e., which appears in online publications will be considered the equivalent of printed publications of the same kind. Other forms of digital scholarship may also be considered evidence of scholarly achievement and will be evaluated based upon their degree of engagement with scholarly sources, originality, impact, and contribution to historical interpretation. Faculty members who wish to have other forms of digital scholarship included in their annual evaluation must provide an explanation of how their work meets

these criteria; they should also offer evidence of peer-review, editorial critique, or other elements of professional scholarly evaluation.

d. Encyclopedia articles of substantial size (more than a few hundred words) that show evidence of significant research in scholarly sources.

e. Minor encyclopedia and historical dictionary articles (those of only a few hundred words), book reviews and “think pieces” (reflective articles expressing opinions or conclusions but not presenting the results of research). However, such items are not as important as those listed in a., b., c., and d. above.

f. Presenting papers at professional meetings and giving invited talks may be considered as evidence of scholarly productivity. Particular value will be placed upon participation in national and international conferences of major professional organizations. Faculty members who wish to have these activities evaluated must describe the peer review process, selection criteria, and audience for each presentation. These activities will not normally be considered as important as items a., b., c., and d. above.

g. Grant activity may be considered as evidence of scholarly achievement. Grants will be evaluated on the basis of proposal feedback from peer-reviewers, the amount of funding, and the prestige of the organization offering funding. Grant activity will generally not be considered as important as items a. and b. above.

h. Other kinds of scholarly activity not listed above will be evaluated on a case by case basis. Faculty members who wish to have other kinds of scholarly activity evaluated must provide detailed descriptions of these activities. Other scholarly activity will be evaluated upon its degree of engagement with scholarly sources, originality, impact, and contribution to historical interpretation. Other scholarly activities will generally not be considered as important as items a. and b. above.

2. The DAC will assess a faculty member’s teaching on the basis of:

- a. Numerical student evaluations
- b. Written student evaluations (if submitted by the faculty member)
- c. Supervision of graduate students
- d. Syllabi and other course materials submitted by the faculty member
- e. Grants relevant to teaching

3. The DAC will assess a faculty member’s record of service including:

- a. Service on Department committees
- b. Service on College of Arts and Sciences committees
- c. Service on University committees
- d. Grants relevant to service activity.
- e. Other service to the Department, the College, the University, profession, and/or the community.