

History Department
**Criteria for Evaluating Probationary Faculty for Tenure and Promotion to Associate
Professor and for Evaluating Tenured Assistant Professors for Promotion to
Associate Professor**

revised September 2015

Accepted by CART 10-9-2015

The Probationary Period Evaluation (untenured faculty only)

1. During the probationary period, the Chair of the Department and normally at least two tenured faculty members will visit the classroom of the probationary faculty member at least once during each semester of the first academic year and at least once annually thereafter. Each evaluator will submit a written assessment of the teaching observed to both the Chair and the candidate.
2. In assessing effective teaching, the evaluating faculty may use varied criteria, which should include:
 - a. Command of the subject matter,
 - b. Clarity of presentation,
 - c. Appropriate use of media/technology,
 - d. Ability to deal effectively with student questions and/or discussion,
 - e. Effective classroom management.
3. At least once each academic year, the department chair will consult with the probationary faculty member to discuss the teaching evaluations, communicate clearly any suggestions for improvements, and advise the faculty member accordingly. The chair's suggestions for improvement will be kept on file in the department.
4. During the fourth or fifth year of their probationary period, the faculty member is required to make a research presentation to the department and/or the wider campus community. If the faculty member was hired with years of credit towards tenure, this presentation should occur in the third or fourth year, as appropriate.
5. The chair shall also consult departmental colleagues regarding the progress of the probationary faculty on matters of service to the college, evidence of scholarship, and support for the mission of the college and of the History Department.

Third Year Review (untenured faculty only)

A thorough review of the probationary faculty member's record of teaching, scholarship, and service should be conducted by the chair in consultation with the tenured members of the department during the candidate's third contract year. The department chair, in consultation at a meeting with the tenured members of the department, should evaluate the faculty member's progress towards tenure and promotion and report that assessment to both the Dean of Arts and Sciences and the Provost. The candidate will be informed of the assessment and the departmental rationale within one week of the meeting, and no later than March 30.

The Tenure and/or Promotion Year

Before the due date stipulated in the *Faculty Handbook*, the faculty member is responsible for assembling a dossier that provides effective evidence of achievement in the areas of teaching, research, and service in accordance with the criteria listed below and in light of the language of the *Faculty Handbook*. Soon after, the dossier shall be made available in the department office and/or online in sufficient time for all eligible faculty in the department to review. No additional materials will be considered after this date.

The faculty member has the right to seek testimony from any internal or external faculty member he or she thinks might provide additional information for the decision of the department and the Committee on Academic Rank and Tenure (CART). Any additional materials must be included with the original dossier or submitted directly to the chair by the due date for the dossier stipulated in the *Faculty Handbook*.

According to the terms of the *Faculty Handbook*, the Chair will schedule a meeting of the eligible members of the department to discuss the merits of the case and conduct a vote. After the discussion, the eligible members of the department will vote by secret ballot on the recommendation to tenure and promote the faculty member based on the criteria of teaching, scholarship, and service. Absentee ballots are precluded from the vote. Votes will be cast on the standard form supplied by the Office of Academic Affairs.

The department chair shall report the results of the department's evaluation, as well as the chair's evaluation, to both the Dean and the Provost on report forms provided by that office by the date stipulated in the *Faculty Handbook*.

Evaluating Teaching

The History Department expects excellence in teaching to be central to the decisions in both tenure and promotion. The characteristics of successful teaching include knowledge or command of the subject matter, clarity of presentation, appropriate use of media or technology, ability to deal effectively with student questions or discussion, and effective classroom management. The evidence of excellence in teaching comes from many sources. These will include:

1. Letters of teaching evaluation by the chair and tenured members of the department, since the third-year review.
2. Representative course syllabi and assignments,
3. Listing of new courses developed or courses substantially revised,
4. Statement of teaching philosophy,

Evidence of excellence in teaching may also include (but is not limited to) representative samples of the following:

1. Letters of teaching evaluation by the Director of DWC/HON or faculty engaged in collaborative teaching with the candidate,
2. Student evaluations of teaching,
3. Examples of student work.

Evaluating Service

The History Department expects its faculty to engage in service. Since service to the History Department is mandatory, it is the main means of demonstrating service. A variety of other types of service may also be considered in the tenure and promotion process. The following list is illustrative, but not exhaustive, of service contributions. The evaluation of an individual's service contributions should take into account the extent and quality of service. Examples of service include:

1. Department Service--committee work, chairing departmental committees, student advising, participation in departmental events (lectures, seminars, receptions), serving as recording secretary at departmental meetings, advising undergraduate and graduate theses, serving on comprehensive exam committees for the graduate program.

2. College Service--service on college committees, service as an undeclared advisor, participation in college-sponsored academic events, Faculty Senate membership, serving as a Faculty Senate officer, serving as the chair of a college or Senate committee, serving as a program director or in another administrative capacity

3. Community Service--contributing to community activities in terms of professional expertise such as serving on a historical agency board, doing local research, or serving the community as part of the college's broader goal as a Roman Catholic and Dominican institution in charitable organizations.

4. Service to the profession-serving as an officer in a professional association, serving as committee member in a regional or national professional organization, moderating discussion groups on the Internet, organizing of sections for regional or national professional conferences, editing of a professional journal.

5. Serving as referee for articles in professional journals; reviewing manuscripts for publishers.

Evaluating Scholarship

To be considered for tenure and promotion, the History Department expects its members to remain actively engaged in quality scholarly research and publication. Scholarship will be evaluated in terms of continuing activity as well as already completed scholarly work, including research and publication. The evaluation process will consist of judgments about the quantity and quality of professional and scholarly work over the entirety of the faculty member's academic career, including evidence that the faculty member is productive at Providence College (but not including the unrevised dissertation itself).

In evaluating scholarship we take special note of both our teaching load and our expectation to teach regularly in the DWC program (which requires all faculty to teach regularly and extensively outside their field of research). When department members publish, especially in refereed venues, they often compete for space with colleagues at other institutions who have lower teaching loads and broad research support. Our expectations for scholarship, however, remain on par with or exceed many of our peer institutions.

As defined by the *Faculty Handbook*, tangible scholarly products that constitute evidence of scholarship: 1. demonstrate a high level of discipline related expertise; 2. have been shared with the relevant scholarly community; and 3. have undergone positive objective peer

review, evidenced by juried evaluation of creative work, and/or refereed evaluation of publications and presentations.

The History Department also expects its members to demonstrate active, continued engagement with their particular field of history.

(1) Successful scholarship

Our standards for scholarship take note of the following principles in determining what constitutes satisfactory scholarship for tenure and promotion. Specific criteria for evaluating successful scholarship are defined after these principles.

- It is imperative that candidates for tenure in history be judged according to the accepted standards of the wider historical field. As explained in the 2012 official statement of the American Historical Association, the governing body of the field: “Since significant research and writing projects in history can stretch over many years, a ‘one size fits all’ approach to annual production cannot afford an accurate gauge of work accomplished in history and comparable disciplines in the humanities.”
- Acceptance for publication in respected, peer-reviewed journals or at a university press requires at least a year or more from submission of the manuscript to acceptance for publication; actual publication may take significantly longer. Historical journals require that each publication contains new research and draws original conclusions, which limits the number of publications historians produce from each research project. In addition, due to the wide range of subfields and specializations, the history profession finds attempts to rank the quality of journals objectively against each other to be meaningless. While acceptance rates are customarily used as a barometer for the prestige of a particular journal, this is not always the case in the field of history. Many journals do not report their acceptance rates. Others, sometimes the most prestigious journals in a particular subfield, have very high acceptance rates due to their methods of soliciting and evaluating articles. For this reason we value all refereed publications that satisfy the criteria outlined below. Candidates are expected to provide evidence that the journal meets these criteria, as well as any other evidence of the selectivity, quality and/or respect of the publication within the field.
- It is standard in the field of history for the first book manuscript as well as journal articles to be based on research conducted initially as part of the dissertation. As

such, publications based on dissertation research are acceptable, as long as they meet the specific criteria listed below.

- As that same 2012 AHA statement continues: “historians inclined toward collaborative work rarely have access to the large multiyear grants that are the hallmark of research conducted in some disciplines. Hence we do not consider collaborative work or grant-funding per se as evidence of superior scholarship or productivity; we assess our scholarship according to the value of what we produce, not according to its cost.” While the history department encourages faculty to pursue appropriate grant opportunities, no faculty member will be penalized for not receiving a grant or for choosing not to apply for grants. Collaborative work will be evaluated according to the same criteria listed below, although the faculty member should make clear their specific role in the collaboration and the final product.
- In evaluating scholarship, faculty will take into account the entire corpus of the candidate’s scholarly work throughout their academic career, including but not limited to scholarship produced while at Providence College, as long as it meets the other criteria listed below. In accordance with the *Faculty Handbook* (3.5.3, b.) “These activities may include scholarly work completed prior to employment at Providence College but must include tangible scholarship product(s) completed as a member of the Providence College faculty unless the candidate was appointed to the College with tenure and promoted rank.”
- We value equally publications in foreign languages as those published in English, as long as they meet the other criteria listed below.
- We do not distinguish between electronic and paper publications, as long as they meet the other criteria listed below.

Criteria for evaluating successful scholarship:

- A. Successful scholarship can be demonstrated in *any* of the following ways, provided that the publications collectively demonstrate a high level of discipline-related expertise, have been shared with the candidate’s given field, and have undergone positive objective peer review.
Candidates for tenure and promotion should meet *one* of the following criteria:
 - a. Book manuscripts published with refereed university presses or other respected presses requiring a rigorous blind peer-review process are the strongest indication of the quality of historical scholarship. As explained in the 2012 AHA

statement: “the single-authored book, based on archival research, has been our core intellectual contribution to knowledge.”

- i. A *signed contract* with such a press, along with a manuscript ready for publication, meets this requirement.
 - ii. In the absence of a full manuscript, a *signed contract* in combination with the types of scholarship outlined in sections b and c, *may* also meet this requirement.
 - iii. The blind peer-review recommendation(s) to the press must be included in the dossier.

- b. Publications in refereed journals with a blind peer-review process are the second gold-standard of the historical profession. A minimum of *two* accepted papers in a *refereed journal* with a blind peer-review process constitutes sufficient scholarship for tenure and promotion to associate professor, provided that the papers demonstrate a high level of discipline-related expertise and/or have evident significance or impact on the candidate’s given field.
 - i. The blind peer-review recommendation(s) to the press must be included in the dossier.
 - ii. Candidates should include evidence of the quality, prestige, and/or respect of the journal. Possible types of evidence might include (but are not limited to):
 1. acceptance rates
 2. the prestige of co-authors in a special issue
 3. the prestige of the press publishing the journal
 4. evidence of respect for the journal within the subfield
 5. the prestige of the journal’s editorial board
 - iii. Book chapters, published in an edited collection with a refereed university press or other respected press requiring a rigorous blind peer-review process, may also substitute for publications in item (b), provided that they demonstrate a high level of discipline-related expertise and/or have evident significance or impact on the candidate’s given field. The blind peer-review recommendation(s) to the press must be included in the dossier, as well as evidence of the quality of the publication.

- c. Other scholarly production that meets the spirit of this scholarship production and demonstrates a high level of discipline-related expertise, has been shared with the candidate’s given field, and has undergone positive objective peer review, as

justified by the candidate and accepted by the eligible members of the department, *may* also meet this requirement. For example, serving as principal editor of a scholarly journal may count as one journal article in item (b); or a publicly engaged project that demonstrates excellence in historical scholarship and recognition at the regional, national, or international level *may* count as one journal article in item (b).

- B. Additionally, candidates should include objective outside evidence of the overall quality of their scholarship. Types of evidence might include (but are not limited to):
- Letter(s) from outside experts in the field who can attest to the quality of their research and/or its impact on the discipline.
 - Blind peer-review recommendation(s) of book manuscripts, journal articles, or book chapters.
 - Formal book reviews of the candidate's published scholarship.
 - Citations of the candidate's scholarship in other scholarly publications.
 - Scholarly awards.
 - Academic grants or fellowships.
 - Invitations to present and/or publish that reflect respect for the candidate's scholarship.

(2) Continued Scholarly Engagement

We expect that faculty will demonstrate a sustained level of scholarly activity, and we value a range of scholarship that demonstrates this focused and continuing level of scholarship. However, we also understand that the great demands placed on probationary faculty who serve in the Development of Western Civilization Program often limits the amount of time for such engagement, especially when they are also engaged in a research project that demands their primary attention.

[Some of these items also constitute *service* to the profession, and may be counted in both sections.]

- presentation of a paper in a workshop or panel at a professional conference
- invited lectures (outside of PC)
- non-refereed historical publications
- edited books that do not meet the requirements under (1)
- book reviews
- article and/or book manuscript reviews

- encyclopedia or reference articles
 - service as a journal editor and/or on an editorial board
 - service on the board of a professional organization within the field
 - receipt of outside grants for historical research
 - documentary translations
 - publicly-engaged projects related to the faculty member's field
 - remaining current in the faculty member's specific subfield
 - other activities which meet the spirit of this engagement requirement, as justified by the candidate and accepted by the eligible members of the department
-

History Department
Criteria for Evaluating Associate Professors for Promotion to Full Professor

revised September 2015

Accepted by CART 10-9-2015

In accordance with the Faculty Handbook, members of the History Department with a minimum of five years' experience in the rank of associate professor, and who have demonstrated "evidence of distinguished achievement in teaching, scholarship, and service" since the attainment of the rank of associate professor (as described in Section 3.4.2 of the Faculty Handbook) are eligible to apply for promotion to full professor.

Members of the History Department who are eligible and wish to apply for promotion to full professor must notify the chair of this intention and provide a complete dossier to the department office, according to the guidelines set forth in the *Faculty Handbook*. When such a request is made, the department chair will notify the members of the department already at the rank of full professor and schedule a meeting of them to consider and vote on the request prior to the deadline set forth in the *Faculty Handbook*.

1. The chair of the History Department and at least two faculty members at the rank of full professor will normally make at least one visit to the classroom of the candidate for promotion before the department vote on promotion.
2. In assessing effective teaching, the evaluating faculty may use varied criteria, which should include:
 - a. Command of the subject matter,
 - b. Clarity of presentation,

- c. Appropriate use of media/technology,
 - d. Ability to deal effectively with student questions and/or discussion,
 - e. Effective classroom management.
3. During any semester subsequent to attaining the rank of associate professor but prior to applying for promotion to full professor, the faculty member is strongly encouraged to make a research presentation to the department and/or to the wider campus community.
4. Before the due date stipulated in the *Faculty Handbook*, the faculty member is responsible for assembling a dossier that provides effective evidence of achievement in the areas of teaching, research, and service in accordance with the criteria listed below and in light of the language of the *Faculty Handbook*. Soon after, the dossier shall be made available in the department office and/or online in sufficient time for all eligible faculty in the department to review. No additional materials will be considered after this date.
- NB: The faculty member has the right to seek testimony from any faculty member or outside evaluator he or she thinks might provide additional information for the final decision of the department and/or the Committee on Academic Rank and Tenure (CART). Any additional materials must be included with the original dossier or submitted directly to the chair by the due date for the dossier stipulated in the *Faculty Handbook*.
5. The chair shall consult both the colleagues who did the above evaluations and the other members of the department concerning the faculty member's scholarship and service to the department.
6. After a meeting and discussion of merits of the case, members of the department who have obtained the rank of full professor shall vote by secret ballot on the recommendation to promote the faculty member, based on the criteria of teaching, service, and scholarship. Absentee ballots are precluded from the vote. Votes will be cast on the standard form supplied by the Office of Academic Affairs. The department chair shall report the results of the department's vote, as well as the chair's evaluation, in the manner stipulated and by the date required in the *Faculty Handbook*.

Evaluating Teaching

The History Department expects excellence in teaching to be central to the decision in promotion to full professor. The characteristics of successful teaching include knowledge or command of the subject matter, clarity of presentation, appropriate use of media or technology, ability to deal effectively with student questions or discussion, and effective

classroom management. The evidence of excellence in teaching comes from many sources. These will include:

1. Representative course syllabi and assignments,
2. Listing of new courses developed or courses substantially revised,
3. Statement of teaching philosophy,

Evidence of excellence in teaching may also include (but is not limited to) representative samples of the following:

1. Letters of teaching evaluation by the chair and tenured members of the department,
2. Letters of teaching evaluation by the Director of DWC/HON or faculty engaged in collaborative teaching with candidate,
3. Student evaluations of teaching.
4. Examples of student work.

Evaluating Service

The History Department expects its faculty to engage in service. Since service to the History Department is mandatory, it is the main means of demonstrating service. A variety of other types of service may also be considered in the promotion process. The following list is illustrative, but not exhaustive, of service contributions. The evaluation of an individual's service contributions should take into account the extent and quality of service. Examples of service include:

1. Department Service--committee work, chairing departmental committees, student advising, participation in departmental events (lectures, seminars, receptions), serving as recording secretary at departmental meetings, advising undergraduate and graduate theses, serving on comprehensive exam committees for the graduate program.

2. College Service--service on college committees, service as an undeclared advisor, participation in college-sponsored academic events, Faculty Senate membership, serving as a Faculty Senate officer, serving as the chair of a college or Senate committee, serving as a program director or in another administrative capacity

3. Community Service--contributing to community activities in terms of professional expertise such as serving on a historical agency board, doing local research, or serving the community as part of the college's broader goal as a Roman Catholic and Dominican institution in charitable organizations.

4. Service to the profession-serving as an officer in a professional association, serving as committee member in a regional or national professional organization, moderating discussion groups on the Internet, organizing of sections for regional or national professional conferences, editing of a professional journal.

5. Serving as referee for articles in professional journals; reviewing manuscripts for publishers.

Evaluating Scholarship

To be considered for promotion to full professor, the History Department expects its members to remain actively engaged in quality scholarly research and publication. Scholarship will be evaluated in terms of continuing activity as well as already completed scholarly work, including research and publication. The evaluation process will consist of judgments about the quantity and quality of professional and scholarly work.

In evaluating scholarship we take special note of both our teaching load and our expectation to teach regularly in the DWC program (which requires all faculty to teach regularly and extensively outside their field of research). When department members publish, especially in refereed venues, they often compete for space with colleagues at other institutions who have lower teaching loads and broad research support. Our expectations for scholarship, however, remain on par with or exceed many of our peer institutions.

As defined by the *Faculty Handbook*, tangible scholarly products that constitute evidence of scholarship: 1. demonstrate a high level of discipline related expertise; 2. have been shared with the relevant scholarly community; and 3. have undergone positive objective peer review, evidenced by juried evaluation of creative work, and/or refereed evaluation of publications and presentations.

The History Department also expects its members to demonstrate active, continued engagement with their particular field of history.

(3) Successful scholarship

Our standards for scholarship take note of the following principles in determining what constitutes satisfactory scholarship for promotion to full professor. Specific criteria for evaluating successful scholarship are defined after these principles.

- In making their judgments faculty should take into account the entire corpus of the faculty member's work *since* promotion to associate professor, which was *not considered* during the process of promotion to associate professor.
- It is imperative that candidates for promotion in history be judged according to the accepted standards of the wider historical field. As explained in the 2012 official statement of the American Historical Association, the governing body of the field: “Since significant research and writing projects in history can stretch over many years, a ‘one size fits all’ approach to annual production cannot afford an accurate gauge of work accomplished in history and comparable disciplines in the humanities.”
- Acceptance for publication in respected, peer-reviewed journals or at a university press requires at least a year or more from submission of the manuscript to acceptance for publication; actual publication may take significantly longer. Historical journals require that each publication contains new research and draws original conclusions, which limits the number of publications historians produce from each research project. In addition, due to the wide range of subfields and specializations, the history profession finds attempts to rank the quality of journals objectively against each other to be meaningless. While acceptance rates are customarily used as a barometer for the prestige of a particular journal, this is not always the case in the field of history. Many journals do not report their acceptance rates. Others, sometimes the most prestigious journals in a particular subfield, have very high acceptance rates due to their methods of soliciting and evaluating articles. For this reason we value all refereed publications that satisfy the criteria outlined below. Candidates are expected to provide evidence that the journal meets these criteria, as well as any other evidence of the selectivity, quality and/or respect of the publication within the field.
- As that same 2012 AHA statement continues: “historians inclined toward collaborative work rarely have access to the large multiyear grants that are the hallmark of research conducted in some disciplines. Hence we do not consider collaborative work or grant-funding per se as evidence of superior scholarship or productivity; we assess our scholarship according to the value of what we produce, not according to its cost.” While the history department encourages faculty to pursue appropriate grant opportunities, no faculty member will be penalized for not receiving a grant or for choosing not to apply for grants. Collaborative work will be

evaluated according to the same criteria listed below, although the faculty member should make clear their specific role in the collaboration and the final product.

- We value equally publications in foreign languages as those published in English, as long as they meet the other criteria listed below.
- We do not distinguish between electronic and paper publications, as long as they meet the other criteria listed below.

Criteria for evaluating successful scholarship:

- A. Successful scholarship can be demonstrated in *any* of the following ways, provided that the publications collectively demonstrate a high level of discipline-related expertise, have been shared with the candidate's given field, and have undergone positive objective peer review.

Candidates for promotion to full professor should meet a minimum of *one* of the following criteria:

- a. Book manuscripts published with refereed university presses or other respected presses requiring a rigorous blind peer-review process are the strongest indication of the quality of historical scholarship. As explained in the 2012 AHA statement: "the single-authored book, based on archival research, has been our core intellectual contribution to knowledge."
 - i. A *signed contract* with such a press, along with a manuscript ready for publication, meets this requirement.
 - ii. In the absence of a full manuscript, a *signed contract* in combination with the types of scholarship outlined in sections b and c, may also meet this requirement.
 - iii. The blind peer-review recommendation(s) to the press must be included in the dossier.
- b. Publications in refereed journals with a blind peer-review process are the second gold-standard of the historical profession. Normally, a minimum of *three to four* papers in refereed journals with a blind peer-review process constitutes sufficient scholarship for promotion to full professor, provided that the papers demonstrate a high level of discipline-related expertise and/or have evident significance or impact on the candidate's given field.

- i. The blind peer-review recommendation(s) to the press must be included in the dossier.
 - ii. Candidates should include evidence of the quality, prestige, and/or respect of the journal. Possible types of evidence might include (but are not limited to):
 - 1. acceptance rates
 - 2. the prestige of co-authors in a special issue
 - 3. the prestige of the press publishing the journal
 - 4. evidence of respect for the journal within the subfield
 - 5. the prestige of the journal's editorial board
 - iii. Book chapters, published in an edited collection with a refereed university press or other respected press requiring a rigorous blind peer-review process, may also substitute for publications in item (b), provided that they demonstrate a high level of discipline-related expertise and/or have evident significance or impact on the candidate's given field. The blind peer-review recommendation(s) to the press must be included in the dossier, as well as evidence of the quality of the publication.
 - c. Other scholarly production that meets the spirit of this scholarship production and demonstrates a high level of discipline-related expertise, has been shared with the candidate's given field, and has undergone positive objective peer review, as justified by the candidate and accepted by the eligible members of the department, *may* also meet this requirement. For example, serving as principal editor of a scholarly journal may count as one journal article in item (b); or a publicly engaged project that demonstrates excellence in historical scholarship and recognition at the regional, national, or international level *may* count as one journal article in item (b).
- B. Additionally, candidates should include objective outside evidence of the overall quality of their scholarship. Types of evidence might include (but are not limited to):
- Letter(s) from outside experts in the field who can attest to the quality of their research and/or its impact on the discipline.
 - Blind peer-review recommendation(s) of book manuscripts, journal articles, or book chapters.
 - Formal book reviews of the candidate's published scholarship.
 - Citations of the candidate's scholarship in other scholarly publications.

- Scholarly awards.
- Academic grants or fellowships.
- Invitations to present and/or publish that reflect respect for the candidate's scholarship.

(4) Continued Scholarly Engagement

We expect that faculty will demonstrate a sustained level of scholarly activity, and we value a range of scholarship that demonstrates this focused and continuing level of scholarship.

[Some of these items also constitute *service* to the profession, and may be counted in both sections.]

- presentation of a paper in a workshop or panel at a professional conference
- invited lectures (outside of PC)
- non-refereed historical publications
- edited books that do not meet the requirements under (1)
- book reviews
- article and/or book manuscript reviews
- encyclopedia or reference articles
- service as a journal editor and/or on an editorial board
- service on the board of a professional organization within the field
- receipt of outside grants for historical research
- documentary translations
- publicly-engaged projects related to the faculty member's field
- remaining current in the faculty member's specific subfield
- other activities which meet the spirit of this engagement requirement, as justified by the candidate and accepted by the eligible members of the department