

Statement on Significant Scholarly Work
Department of History, St. Olaf College
March 7, 2016

Introduction

Recognizing that excellent teaching is nourished by excellent scholarship, the Department of History expects active and committed participation in significant scholarly and other professional activity by its members. The Department takes an expansive view of what constitutes such work, acknowledges that the discipline draws upon a wide variety of methodologies and approaches, and regards this diversity as a reflection of strength and vitality. For the same reasons, the Department values historians' participation in interdisciplinary inquiry. The Department also supports the dissemination of historical scholarship among wider publics in innovative ways.

Since historical practices change and vary from field to field, the Department does not set rigid quantitative standards that would obviate the need for collegial evaluation and judgment.

Types of Scholarly Activity

Historians typically engage in the following types of scholarly and professional activities, listed in descending order of significance:

- Original research that engages primary sources.
- Synthetic, integrative, or interpretive historical work that is part of a scholarly conversation about others' original research.
- Systematic reflection on student learning that is documented by methodologies appropriate to the discipline of History, located in the literature of the discipline and of student learning, and publicly disseminated.
- Publicly engaged scholarly activity that makes the past available to the wider community, including civic/community engagement, museum exhibits, historical societies, broadcast media, and digital projects. While the outcome of this type of scholarly activity differs from traditional emphasis on the monograph or journal article, the work nevertheless has rigorous standards and can also be peer-reviewed.
- Mentored undergraduate research contributing to faculty publication in any of the above categories.
- Professional leadership in national and international professional organizations.

The Department does not require all members to participate in all these activities, and recognizes that the proportion of activity across types of scholarship may vary over the course of a career.

Determination of Significance

In its evaluation of all the types of scholarly and professional activity identified above, the Department privileges peer-reviewed scholarly books and articles over other work. It values completed work over work in progress, scholarly works over works of popularization, individual or co-authorship over collaborative publications, presentations to scholarly audiences over those to general audiences, and activity in international and national venues over that in regional and local venues (except in highly specialized or emerging fields in which regional and local conferences and organizations are most active and professionally recognized).

The Department recognizes the importance of the validation of historians' contributions that honors, awards, and grants can provide. It values those from external organizations over those awarded by the College; those that are peer-reviewed over those that are not; and those received from international or national organizations, (e.g., the National Endowment for the Humanities, the American Council of Learned Societies) over those from regional or local organizations (e.g., Minnesota Humanities Commission).

A candidate may present a range of work for review; the significance of contributions may vary as well. For example, a review essay published in the *American Historical Review*, the discipline's flagship journal, may be valued more highly than an article in the published proceedings of a conference. Therefore, while the following examples are ranked in roughly descending order, their evaluation is subject to considered opinion expressed in letters written for the candidate's dossier.

- Scholarly books of greatest significance include: monographs, translations, or editorship of essay collections or critical editions. Examples of lesser significance: textbooks, books popularizing history or historical topics.
- Scholarly articles of greatest significance include those in peer-reviewed journals or peer-reviewed edited volumes. Of lesser significance: articles in published proceedings, contributions to edited volumes, review essays, historiographical essays, scholarly book reviews, articles on historical topics in popular journals,
- Papers and presentations of greatest significance: invited presentations to scholarly audiences, papers delivered at national or international professional conferences or conventions, papers delivered at regional or local professional meetings. Of lesser significance: panel participation as moderator or discussant at conferences or conventions.
- Professional leadership: Examples of greatest significance: editorship of a journal, peer review of manuscripts and grant proposals. Of lesser significance: leadership in professional organizations, conference planning, public lectures on historical topics to general audiences, creation or development of Web sites related to history or the teaching of history.

Expectations for Accomplishment at each Stage of Review

- The Department recognizes that the trajectory of each candidate's career will develop at a different pace, with different emphases and outcomes over time. Nevertheless, the Department expects all candidates for review to show evidence of sustained engagement with scholarship across the arc of their careers. A candidate whose dossier includes a manuscript must provide documentation regarding the stage of the formal review process for publication at which the manuscript stands. As rank advances, growth as a scholar, balanced against increased evidence of service to the institution and to the profession, may manifest itself in increased engagement with other types of scholarship in addition to original research. As rank advances, grant-writing should *typically* be directed toward external agencies.
- The comprehensive review preceding the tenure review (commonly in the fourth year)
 - For this review the candidate should provide evidence of a coherent agenda of original research and consistent engagement in scholarly activity during each year of appointment to date. Evidence may include (in roughly descending order) appropriate published work, presentation of scholarly papers in appropriate venues, work in progress, and application for and/or obtaining external and/or internal grants.
- Tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor
 - In presenting evidence of achievement—and not merely promise—a candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor ought to focus on original research.
 - A candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor is not required to have published a book; without a book, the candidate should *typically* present at least two or three scholarly articles in major peer-reviewed journals.
- Promotion to the rank of Professor
 - A candidate for promotion to this rank must present evidence of continued scholarly publication of significance, *typically* based on original research. Other types of scholarship may also be presented.
 - New work presented for review may reflect a deepening of one's original scholarly focus or engagement with a new field.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~