

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
ANNUAL PEER REVIEW GUIDELINES
Revised April 2022

1. PREAMBLE

As members of a department in a Research I University, we regard excellence in teaching and scholarship as the foundation of our professional work, and annual peer reviews will take into account this fundamental principle as overall ratings are determined for individual faculty. Scholarship entails responsibilities to a number of different audiences - those in the profession, those in the classroom, and those in the community.

These guidelines have the following purposes:

1. To recognize labor and achievement equally.
2. To present an accurate and positive image of the department to the administration.
3. To give due and equal weight to research, teaching, and service as is appropriate in the field of history in our department.

Faculty who fail to furnish the specified information required in their professional activity reports may not receive full credit for their achievements.

All members of the Department should serve on the peer review committee. These guidelines are binding on all members of the peer review committee.

2. SUGGESTED DATA FOR HISTORY FACULTY ACTIVITY REPORT

This sheet is designed to help you recall your activities for the annual performance review. In providing information to the peer review committee you may omit any items you feel are not applicable and add others of your own choosing. It would be helpful if you followed this order in presenting your report. Attached are copies of the Departmental criteria for the annual performance review (research and publication, teach, and service). Please use the following categories, adopted by the American Historical Association, for listing your publications:

“Published”	actually in print or on line.
“In Press”	fully copyedited and out of the author’s hands. In the final stages of the production process.
“Forthcoming”	a completed manuscript has been accepted by a press or journal.
“Under contract”	a press and an author have signed a contract for a book in progress,

but the final manuscript has not yet been submitted.
“Submitted” or “under consideration”
the book or article has been submitted to a press or journal, but
there is as yet no contract or agreement to publish.

- I. RESEARCH AND PUBLICATION (last 5 years)
 - A. Publications: refereed books and articles, with date published
 - B. Paper and conference presentations
 - C. Public History projects, museum exhibits, web-based resources, podcasts, and other creative work
 - D. Prizes, awards, grants, fellowships
 - E. Work submitted for publication (see categories above)
 - F. Other publications scholarly activities: refereed articles, reviews, encyclopedia entries, translations, etc.
 - G. Grant proposals submitted
 - H. Work in progress (not yet submitted)
- II. TEACHING (spring, summer, fall, winter semesters of one calendar year)
 - A. Courses taught, enrollments, copies of syllabi (required)
 - B. Extra-load teaching
 - C. Copies of students' evaluations (required) and comments if desired
 - D. Self-evaluation of teaching; information pertaining to extra efforts, etc.
 - E. Graduate Committees, MA, PhD major advisor, committee member
 - F. Other graduate and undergraduate advising/counseling
 - G. Teaching awards and recognition
 - H. Teaching publications
- III. SERVICE (one year)
 - A. Department
 - B. University
 - C. Profession
 - D. Community
 - E. Other

3. RESEARCH AND PUBLICATION

The History department requires a scholarly monograph and several articles for promotion to associate and a record of performance of high quality for promotion to full. The following guidelines are designed to encourage and reward tangible progress toward those goals, while not penalizing active scholars for irregularities in presses' publication schedules. Because a monograph or equivalent work of research often involve years of labor with little credit, we acknowledge and reward this work for five years. The table below should guide the peer review committee in assigning ratings.

In addition to the quantitative measures listed below, University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines state that associate professors and above “must present evidence that the results of these efforts have contributed to their field of study, professional discipline, or local, regional, national, or international constituencies.” Please indicate which of your achievements reflect such contributions. Colleagues who have published their work outside the traditional university press channels are invited to explain how much and what kind of research is involved in those publications. The peer review committee should also consider whether a particular achievement merits a higher rating because of special factors. Faculty members who believe this may be the case should discuss the reasons in their reports.

Achievements should be aggregated for higher ratings. Thus, any two achievements rating "exceeds expectations" may be aggregated for a rating of "truly exceptional". For example, two articles published in the same year would rate "truly exceptional" for scholarship. Similarly, three different achievements which constitute evidence of an active research agenda, when produced in a single year, win "exceeds expectations" for scholarship.

Any colleague who has not produced in the last five years any of the tangible products listed below under "meets expectations" but who continues to pursue their research should provide evidence of their work. (This might consist of visiting archives or other activities to gather evidence, or drafts of potential papers or publications.)

Any publication in purely electronic format, if supported by the same processes of peer review, will be considered as the equivalent of traditional publications.

Textbooks, including books that pass into use as textbooks, should be placed either under research or teaching at the discretion of the faculty member. The categorization will be indicated in the narrative of the annual peer review report and in the classification of the item in the report.

Rating Categories

<i>Achievement</i>	<i>Rating</i>
Publication of a single-authored or co-authored scholarly monograph or research equivalent to that needed for promotion to full professor; consult P&T Guidelines.	"Truly exceptional" <i>Overall</i>
Award of a fellowship yielding leave of at least two semesters (when leave begins)	"Truly exceptional" for scholarship
Acceptance for publication of a scholarly monograph	"Truly exceptional" for scholarship for assistant professors; "exceeds expectations" for others
Serving as editor of a volume, special issue	"Exceeds expectations" for scholarship

of a journal, or a new edition of primary sources.	
Publication of a peer-review or scholarly article	"Exceeds expectations" for scholarship
Publication of introduction to edited volume or edited volume of journal equivalent to a scholarly article	"Exceeds expectations" for scholarship
Revised edition of a book, or a monograph, prize, or grant for which truly exceptional was awarded within the past 5 years	"Exceeds expectations" for scholarship
Award for a book or article	"Exceeds expectations" for scholarship
Award of a fellowship yielding leave of at least one semester	"Exceeds expectations" for scholarship
Curator of a public history project or a museum exhibition and catalogue.	"Exceeds expectations" for scholarship
Development of significant web-based or other forms of non-print scholarly resources, podcasts, or any creative work that depends on or engages with traditional scholarship.	"Exceeds expectations" for scholarship
Active research program, signified by: presentation of conference papers; publications in conference proceedings; submission or acceptance of a scholarly article; doing translations for publication; submission of grant proposals; publishing	"Meets expectations" for scholarship

historiographical review essays; award of minor grants; presentation of work at the University of Arizona; invitations to present one's work at other institutions or professional meetings; organizing conference panel; publication of book reviews or encyclopedia entries; publication of article or book in the previous five years	
Inactive research program, one for which there is objective evidence of its existence,	"Needs improvement" for scholarship

but no evidence of movement toward peer-review publication	
No research program, one for which there is no objective evidence of scholarly activity in the last five years	"Unsatisfactory" for scholarship

Here is the same thing in a different format.

"Truly exceptional" overall: Publication of a single-authored or co-authored scholarly monograph or research equivalent to that needed for promotion to full professor; consult P&T Guidelines.

"Truly exceptional" for Research: publication of monograph, award of fellowship that permits two semesters leave for teaching (in semester that leave begins), or acceptance of monograph for publication (for assistant professors). Faculty will receive "truly exceptional" for research for the four years following the publication of a single-authored research monograph. Faculty will receive "truly exceptional" for research for the two years following the publication of a co-authored research monograph. And faculty will receive "truly exceptional" in research for one year when they publish an edited volume, a translated volume, or a revised edition of a textbook.

"Exceeds expectations": publication of peer-reviewed article, edited volume with introduction equivalent to an article, or revised edition of book; award for book or article, award of fellowship that permits one semester leave from teaching; editing a volume, special issue, or collection of primary sources; curating a public history project or museum exhibition; development of web-based resource, podcast, or other creative work.

"Meets expectations": objective evidence for an active research program, including presentation of conference papers, publications in conference proceedings or other venues, submission or acceptance of a scholarly article, translations for publication, submission of grant proposals, publishing historiographical review essays; award of minor grants; presentation of work at the University of Arizona; invitations to present one's work at other institutions or professional meetings; organizing conference panel; publication of book reviews or encyclopedia entries; publication of article or book in the previous five years

"Needs improvement": inactive research program, that is, there is objective evidence of its existence but no evidence of movement toward peer-review publication.

"Unsatisfactory": no objective evidence of scholarly activity in the past five years.

4. TEACHING

The History Department accepts as a fundamental principle that good teaching cannot take place if students fail to shoulder a commensurate share of the responsibility for learning. The syllabus handed out at the beginning of each semester constitutes a tangible intellectual, moral, and social contract, which, as is true of all contracts, involves two parties. Consequently, we have tried to design an instrument that would allow us to evaluate the teaching-learning process and to better assess whether faculty colleagues are meeting adequately their share of the joint responsibility.

Faculty will be rewarded for regularly teaching courses at multiple levels (introductory, advanced undergraduate, and graduate); for teaching required courses such as 301, 498, or 695K; and for teaching large courses with enrollments over 100.

The following materials must be submitted:

- Copies of syllabi for courses taught and enrollments
- Student evaluations (departmental or TCE forms)

The following materials may also be submitted:

- Self-evaluation of teaching, including course materials
- Evidence of/information regarding teaching overloads, extra efforts, distinction, including 500-level sections, new courses, teaching awards, etc.

We recognize the value of peer classroom reviews of teaching, especially for those at the critical junctures of the promotion and tenure process and those for whom problems have been identified (see below). The Annual Peer Review Committee, however, does not have the time and resources to adequately assess every colleague's classroom teaching every year.

Textbooks, including books that pass into use as textbooks, should be placed either under research or teaching at the discretion of the faculty member. The categorization will be indicated in the narrative of the annual peer review report and in the classification of the item in the report.

Rating Categories

“Truly exceptional” should be awarded for winning a teaching award, publishing a textbook, or exhibiting a combination of 3 or more criteria which would garner Exceeds expectations

"Exceeds expectations" should be awarded for demonstrated excellent teaching as determined by criteria including but not limited to student evaluations (for guidelines on the use of student evaluations see below). Evidence of highly meritorious teaching should be described in detail and may include:

- Leadership role in developing unit curricula, providing evaluation of the teaching effectiveness of other faculty, and contributing to more effective unit teaching approaches" (assistant professors; associates and above normal expected to do this)
- Teaching evaluations substantially above the department average
- Special efforts to develop writing or analytical skills
- Efforts to expand command of new instructional technologies
- Serving on more than the average number of graduate committees; or, for assistant professors, serving on more than half the average number.
- Dissertation defense, PhD comprehensive examination
- Teaching a 500-level section that meets regularly, with a separate syllabus
- Three of more of the following: 399, 499, 599, 699, Honors thesis, MA thesis, meeting regularly
- Training TAs
- Teaching courses in excess of four per year
- Teaching a new course
- Curriculum development grant

"Meets expectations" should reflect general competence, consisting in:

- Teaching regular course offerings (usually 4 courses per year)
- Syllabi that clearly set out the goals, requirements, and readings for the course
- Punctuality for class, office hours, and return of assignments
- Fairness and impartiality toward students
- Formal and informal student mentoring
- Writing letters of reference
- Involving students in research
- Student satisfaction, as measured by evaluation forms: rating below 3.0 for "Overall Teaching Effectiveness" will be investigated by the committee. See below for discussion of the use of student evaluations.

"Needs improvement" should be awarded in cases where the criteria for meets expectations are not met, i.e., in which teaching problems are identified and confirmed by the committee. Only after peer- recommended guidance, pursued in good faith by the instructor, fails to improve the problem, should the peer review committee recommend extradepartmental remedies such as the Teaching Center or other resources.

"Unsatisfactory" should be assigned in cases of blatant dereliction of duty well documented violations of pedagogical ethics.

Guidelines for Interpreting Student Evaluation Forms

1. Although an important indicator of teaching effectiveness, student evaluations are merely one measure of that effectiveness. The peer review committee shall use student evaluations *in conjunction with other evidence* in assessing a faculty member's individual contributions to the Department's teaching mission.
2. Given that the Department allows instructors to choose between the departmental and TCE evaluation forms, the peer review committee shall give equal consideration to student responses regardless of the form chosen.
3. In considering student evaluations, the peer review committee shall not base its assessment of student response on isolated statements or praise or dissatisfaction. Since the TCE forms contain statistical measures, the evaluation must respond to the statistical norm, not the outlying values. Nor shall the committee base its assessment on the evaluations from any single course. Instead, the committee is required to take into account the evaluations from *all* courses taught by the instructor in the previous calendar year and to examine the evaluations from those courses for *general patterns* in student responses.
 - A. If the general pattern indicated an acceptable level of reported student satisfaction, then, all other things being equal, the committee shall assign a rating of "meets expectations" in teaching.
 - B. In conjunction with other evidence, a consistent and general pattern of especially high levels of reported student satisfaction may be used to assign a rating of "exceeds expectations" or "truly exceptional" in teaching.
 - C. If the evaluations reveal a general and consistent pattern of high levels of reported student dissatisfaction, the committee shall investigate that pattern as a possible indicator of problems in teaching competence. If the investigation yields evidence indicating that the faculty member has failed to meet other criteria for "meets expectations", the committee will assign a rating of "needs improvement" in teaching. In those exceptional cases where the evidence points to blatant dereliction of duty or well-documented violations of pedagogical ethics, the committee will assign a rating of "unsatisfactory."
4. In its assessment of relative levels of student satisfaction as reported on evaluation forms, the peer review committee shall take into account the size of the class enrollment in the courses taught and their level.

5. Before using student evaluations to assign a rating of "needs improvement" or "unsatisfactory" in teaching, the peer review committee should request information on the faculty member's ratings in previous years. In the absence of other evidence, it would seem unlikely that an instructor whose teaching has been rated meritorious or highly meritorious would suddenly lose his or her competence and effectiveness in teaching. Nevertheless, where the student evaluations indicate a serious decline in teaching effectiveness and competence from one year to the next, a rating of "needs improvement" may be warranted; the committee should, moreover, voice its concerns about the matter in its assessment of the faculty member's competence and effectiveness in teaching.
6. Additional guidelines for interpreting student evaluations:
 - For a faculty member who has chosen to use the Departmental forms, which have a largely narrative format, the peer review committee must take special care in detecting general patterns in student responses. Committee members who, because of time constraints, cannot read every single evaluation from a course may use a sampling technique (i.e., reading every fifth or tenth evaluation). If the sampled evaluations seem to suggest a pattern of problems, the committee member and/or the committee as a whole shall review all evaluations to determine whether the problems indicated in the sample do indeed reflect a general pattern. The same procedure will be applied in cases where no clear pattern emerges from the sampled evaluations.
 - For a faculty member who has chosen to use the TCE forms, the peer review committee shall consider the quantified results from only the following questions: 1 (overall rating of instructor's teaching effectiveness), 3 (overall rating of the course), 4 (rating of instructor compared with other instructors the student has had), and 11 (difficulty of the course). The review committee shall also take into account the written commentary section of the TCE forms, especially in those cases where a sizeable share of all enrolled students provide written comments, and shall pay special attention to those cases where the general pattern in those responses seems to contradict the quantified results to questions 1, 3, 4, and 11.
7. In reporting its findings to the Head, the committee should take special care in quoting from student evaluations. It should not, for instance, quote a single statement of student dissatisfaction to characterize the teaching effectiveness of the faculty member under review. If the committee chooses to use quotations from student responses in its reports, the *set* of quotations used should reflect the *general* pattern revealed in the student evaluations.

8. Along with its ratings, the committee will include a brief narrative of each faculty member's most notable successes, achievements, and contributions for the year.

Procedures for Verification of Identified Problems in Teaching

No colleague shall be in jeopardy of receiving "Needs improvement" unless the committee has documentary evidence of dereliction in at least three areas listed under "Meets expectations" and after the due process specified below.

Neither the committee nor the head shall use unrepresentative student evaluations as the basis for negative comments in the performance review. For a determination of what counts as representative, see "Guidelines for interpreting student evaluations," below.

The due process shall proceed as follows:

1. In a spirit of collegiality and problem solving, the committee shall furnish the colleague with written documentation of the basis for its concerns and invite a response, either in writing or in a face-to-face meeting, or both. The committee must agree on and inform the colleague in writing of the reason for and purpose of any meeting or other investigation. The purpose of any meeting or investigation is to allay concerns: colleagues must not be punished for speaking candidly. The colleague must also be informed in a timely manner of the outcome of any meeting, preferably in the meeting itself.
2. If a colleague's response fails to ally the committee's concerns, classroom visits will be in order. In turn, the colleague in question is entitled to request classroom visits. Classroom visits are to be used only to confirm or invalidate specific documented concerns.
3. Any written evaluation must be preceded by consultation between the committee and the faculty member, as well as between the committee and the Head. Advice to pursue extradepartmental remedies such as the Teaching Center are the responsibility of the Head and not the committee.

5. SERVICE

Faculty service includes service within the department, on the college and university levels, participation and service in professional associations, consulting, and service or outreach to the local, national, and international community. Amount of service and level of leadership should be proportional to rank (see below) and should take into account the diversity of individual talents and the differing demands of the various fields. Service is

evaluated on a yearly basis. Unless the terms of the leave specify otherwise, colleagues on leave are not expected to perform service to the Department or the University. The following activities are examples of what should be included in an evaluation of service.

Department: Serve on standing committees, ad-hoc committees, special events, or as graduate or undergraduate degree advisors (academic advising is considered under teaching); assist in publicity and fundraising efforts; assist Phi Alpha Theta and History Graduate Association; mentor junior faculty; liaison with other units on campus; develop websites or direct listservs.

University: Serve on college or university committees, Faculty Senate, or other elected office (participation in faculty governance); serve on committees in other units (e.g., Women's Studies, Middle East Center, etc.); act as faculty advisor for a student group; represent the university in external organizations; direct area studies programs or other units

Profession: Serve as officer or committee member for professional organization (indicate elected or appointed); read grant applications; serve on prize committee (e.g., reading essays or books); edit book series; serve on editorial board or as book review editor; edit newsletter for professional organization; review book or article manuscript for press or journal; serve as textbook consultant; organize professional meeting, conference, or workshop; teach in a foreign country as invited specialist.

Community: Give a presentation to a community group, school, extension course, or a series of public lectures; speak on radio or television; or to a governmental body; provide a non-credit course or portion thereof; present a workshop sharing expertise with community organizations; mentor non-college students.

Rating Categories

"Truly exceptional" should be reserved for service exceptional in nature, quality, or amount, or service above and beyond the call of duty. The following may also be cause for an award of truly exceptional: Professional service award or other external recognition of outstanding service; presidency of professional association; editor of a journal; organizing a conference here or elsewhere; a high level of engagement in public outreach as a "public intellectual," through such activities as being quoted in major national or international media, through writing for national or international media, or through exceptional outreach activity at the local level. Combination of two or more services listed for "Exceeds expectations."

"Exceeds expectations" indicates service above the average amount for rank (see below). The following types of services may also be cause for an award of exceeds expectations: Director of Graduate Studies; Director of Undergraduate Studies; program committee for major professional meeting; reading grant applications; book prize committee service; or similar services.

"Meets expectations" should be awarded in cases where faculty demonstrate levels of service appropriate to rank. The University Promotion and Tenure service guidelines are quite explicit and can be used as a guideline. Accordingly,

Assistant professors should be contributing to the work of the department as assigned at least a minimum of service at the college and university levels, beginning to take a role in professional organizations and peer review, and seeking ways to make their expertise available to the wider community.

Associate professors should have begun to develop a habit of service; their judgments are professionally respected and valued; and they have demonstrated the ability and an interest in finding linkages between their discipline and public interests, needs, and opportunities. They

contribute to academic planning at the unit level and, perhaps, at the college and university levels, by effectively carrying out committee assignments.

participate in local, regional, and national meetings; are active in professional societies, and participate in peer review processes.

share their professional expertise with the public through outreach avenues such as local schools, agencies, commissions, consulting assignments, or panels.

lead in developing unit curricula, evaluate the teaching effectiveness of other faculty, and contribute to more effective unit teaching approaches.

Full professors should have accepted much more service responsibility than is required for lower ranks. Evidence of service/ outreach may include, but is not limited to the following: leadership in faculty governance, in mentoring of junior faculty, in establishing academic unit and college goals, objectives and performance standards; participation in professional associations, on professional review panels, and in the review of journal articles, grants, and proposals; work with governmental and non-profit agencies around one's disciplinary expertise; presentation of community lectures or performances.

"Needs improvement" should be awarded in those cases in which criteria for meets expectations are not met, i.e., in which level of service is demonstrably inadequate to rank, or serious problems are identified and confirmed by the peer review process. After peer-recommended guidance, pursued in good faith by the faculty member, fails to

improve the problem, the peer review committee should recommend that the faculty member consult other resources to remedy the identified problem.

“Unsatisfactory” clearly designates unacceptable performance. This rating should be assigned in cases of no service or well documented ethical violations in a given year.