

## HISTORY DEPARTMENT SCHOLARSHIP STANDARDS (NOV. 2013)

In the field of history, a successful scholar demonstrates scholarly development, accomplishment, and promise by producing high-quality, original, published works of scholarship and by participating actively in scholarly discourse with professional peers.

### PRODUCTION OF SCHOLARSHIP

The history department at Lafayette College possesses a deep commitment to the production of peer-reviewed scholarship based on the analysis of primary sources and in conversation with other secondary analyses. The history department expects faculty to actively engage in the production of various forms of historical scholarship, such as historical monographs, peer-reviewed journal articles, and conference papers.

In most cases, historians produce scholarship as individual authors, although the department recognizes that co-authored research can make significant contributions to the field. For co-authored works, department members are expected to make their own contributions explicit when describing such publications for a tenure or promotion file. In cases where a department member's contributions merit such consideration, co-authored work may be weighted equally to a single-author piece.

The department recognizes that history is generally considered a "book discipline" and that our standards should reflect those broadly held at peer institutions. Therefore, we consider the monograph to be an important component of a tenure candidate's scholarly portfolio. We therefore expect, in the normal course of events, that candidates complete a monograph for submission in the tenure file. As one of many genres of historical writing, the monograph uniquely demonstrates a historian's ability to pose and answer large questions, to develop sustained arguments, and to make significant contributions to the historical record. It is the result of a long-term project requiring years of planning and execution.

Nearly all historians, nationwide, base their first book on their dissertation. Most History PhDs write dissertations on topics of their own choosing, often quite far removed from the specific work conducted by their dissertation advisors. In the vast majority of cases, dissertations are not considered for publication by high quality academic presses unless they have undergone a substantial process of revision. These revisions may include (but are not limited to): changes in the theoretical, methodological, or conceptual apparatus of the manuscript, adding new material to expand the time periods or regions studied, or shortening the text considerably and providing a sharper focus to the presentation and analysis. Furthermore, the process of securing a contract from a publisher can be very lengthy. Publishers normally require that authors give them the exclusive right to consider a manuscript. This can tie up a manuscript for months, even years, as the decision to publish depends not only on the comments of peer reviewers but also on the views of the marketing department and ultimately a broader board of editors. Once accepted, the manuscript then frequently takes two years or more of additional work as authors do revisions, work with copyeditors, secure permissions

agreements from rights holders, work on indexes, illustrations, maps, and glossaries, and tend to other publication details requiring significant attention from the author.

For all of these reasons, the history department understands that transforming a dissertation into a book manuscript with a quality press is a substantial intellectual project that, in itself, demonstrates both **active engagement** in the advancement of knowledge and **promise of further professional growth**. Candidates who have book manuscripts accepted by presses that include a rigorous review process do not require evidence of a new project beyond that manuscript to establish either active engagement or promise. In addition, the department recognizes the regular production of peer-reviewed articles and other works of original scholarship as evidence of both **active engagement** in the advancement of knowledge and **promise of future professional growth**. The balance of books and articles may vary from candidate to candidate. Faculty with books in print will be expected to have at least one additional peer-reviewed publication, and those with an unpublished manuscript will be expected to have several pieces of peer-reviewed scholarship.

While the department values acceptance of a manuscript by a high-quality peer-reviewed press, we recognize that relying on the judgment of the increasingly profit-driven academic publishing industry is not a perfect mechanism for determining the scholarly merit of a manuscript. In cases in which candidates present a finished, but unpublished, manuscript, the department will consider the manuscript on its merits and the feedback of external reviewers who specialize in the candidate's field. In these instances, the department will carefully examine the entire body of the candidate's work (both published and unpublished) in order to judge whether the candidate shows promise for a long and productive scholarly career.

The history department recognizes that many digital publications require peer-review and that new forms of digital scholarship are emerging. Digitally published scholarship is treated by the history department according to the same standards as printed scholarship. To be considered as evidence of scholarly achievement, digitally published scholarship must be based on original research. More weight will be given to digitally published scholarship that undergoes a peer-review process, while original works of scholarship are given more weight than editorial work or translations.

The department also recognizes the value of writing books that are not monographs. Historians write many different types of books, and the line between these genres is often unclear. Though the department values books based on original work with primary sources more highly than other types of books, the department encourages and rewards all forms of book authorship.

Throughout this document, we understand "peer-review" to be a process in which an expert whose identity is normally hidden from the author offers an evaluation of the merits of a scholarly work and plays a role in the publication decision.

To be more specific, after the monograph the history department recognizes the following categories of publication as "original works of scholarship" in roughly descending order of importance. Though a particular scholar's mix of publications will depend on a number of factors, it is especially important for candidates to produce publications that fall under "group one."

### Group 1: Peer Reviewed Publications

- a. Articles in peer-reviewed journals (English or other languages)
- b. Chapters in peer-reviewed books
- c. Papers in peer-reviewed conference proceedings
- d. Other peer-reviewed original scholarship

### Group 2: Published Research

- a. Chapters published in non-refereed books
- b. Papers published in conference proceedings
- c. Other non-refereed original scholarship

### Group 3: Editorial Work

- a. Editorship of a collection of scholarly essays
- b. Editorship of annotated collection of documents
- c. Editorship of digital repository with significant contributions to metadata structure and content.

### Group 4: Translation

- a. Translations of documents with annotations
- b. Translations of scholarly works into English

*Note: These categories of “original works of scholarship” are applicable for tenure and promotion, tenure only, and promotion to professor reviews.*

## ACTIVE PARTICIPATION IN SCHOLARLY DISCOURSE

The history department expects faculty to be continuously engaged with the larger scholarly community. A record of continuous scholarly engagement, as demonstrated through work in venues such as conferences, reviews, blogs, invited talks and grant or fellowship applications, is an important element of a candidate's tenure file. The department considers the following forms of publication and scholarly activities as evidence of such participation. These categories are not rank-ordered.

- Published reviews and commentary, such as book reviews, contributions to blog sites related to the faculty's area of expertise, and substantive contributions to scholarly online communities (e.g. H-Net). Contributions to edited sites will be weighted more heavily than sites which allow members to post directly.
- Internal and external grant and fellowship awards and applications.
- Presentations to outside audiences, either in the form of invited lectures or at academic conferences

- Participation in conferences and workshops as organizer or discussant
- Work in public history, from op/eds and letters to the editor to work on museum exhibitions, historical documentaries to media appearances. A candidate's contributions to public history will be weighted depending on her or his level of scholarly input and oversight responsibilities.

Regular participation in these activities during the candidate's probationary period will be taken by the department as evidence of future promise as a member of the community of scholars.

*Note: These categories of "scholarly discourse" are applicable for tenure and promotion, tenure only, and promotion to professor reviews.*