EVALUATION OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE IN FULFILLMENT OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES: DEPARTMENT OF THE HISTORY OF SCIENCE

Introduction

The principal responsibilities of the faculty of the Department of the History of Science are teaching and research. The relative importance of these two activities is roughly equal. Professional and University service, while they comprise a significant part of each faculty member's responsibility, are less important activities than teaching and research. Accordingly, full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty will normally be evaluated by assuming that, in a given year, 40% of their time is devoted to teaching, 40% to research, and 20% to service. Other ratios may be determined by special circumstances, such as research or administrative appointments. Variations from these ratios may be negotiated by agreement between a member of the faculty and committee 'A'.

Teaching

Faculty members of this department have important responsibilities in instruction at both undergraduate and graduate levels. The faculty member's primary teaching responsibility lies in instruction in the department's regularly-scheduled courses and seminars, as well as in the direction and supervision of graduate and undergraduate students in research, special studies, independent study, and readings. Also considered as fulfilling the teaching role are activities such as development of new courses, revision of existing courses, mentoring of graduate assistants in their fulfillment of instructional duties, and securing of grants in support of instruction. Some aspects of academic advising may also be instructional.

Scholarly research is considered to play a critical role in the development of each faculty member as a teacher. In particular, active engagement in research is essential for the faculty member's function as teacher and guide of graduate students.

Teaching is evaluated by a number of methods. The faculty maintains a tradition of free access to colleagues' classes and seminars. Formally arranged peer evaluation of teaching performance in classes or seminars takes place at least once a year for tenure-track faculty (usually once or more each semester), and at least once every other year for tenured faculty. Other ways of assessing teaching performance include review of course syllabi and other course materials (assembled reading sets, study questions, essay assignments, examinations), student evaluations of faculty instruction, and students' performance -- in advanced courses, field essay exercises, or general examinations -- for which a faculty member's instruction prepared them.

When faculty teach outside the department or collaborate in teaching interdisciplinary courses, the instructor should negotiate an appropriate means of evaluating that teaching with

Committee 'A' before the annual evaluation of the year in which the teaching takes place. In addition to the means of evaluation described above, evaluations made by other academic units or interdisciplinary programs should be forwarded to Committee 'A' for inclusion in the 'Teaching' portion of that instructor's annual evaluation.

The means of evaluation given above are intended to be indicative and not exhaustive. Not all means of evaluation need be employed on a given occasion. Other means of evaluation may be added or substituted by negotiation with Committee 'A'.

Research

Research is scholarly activity which is directed toward and culminates in publication. Normally, publication takes the form of public dissemination of research results in books, articles and essays in journals and books, essay reviews, and electronic media. Presentation of research in papers at professional meetings also constitutes a research achievement, although often as a stage on the way toward eventual print or electronic publication, and is considered of somewhat less importance or merit. Research proposals and grants will also be considered in evaluating research activity.

Judgments will be made of the quality, as well as the quantity, of research. In an integrative discipline such as ours, evaluations of the research of one member of the department faculty by others are possible and desirable. Judgments of the quality of research may be guided in part, as well, by such considerations as the differing standards and rigor of publication review and refereeing, quality and circulation of journals or presses, assessments expressed in published reviews, and the extent and character of citations to the research; such guides may require modification in the case of publication in electronic media. At critical junctures such as tenure and promotion decisions, intradepartmental evaluations of research should be augmented by the opinions of recognized scholars outside the university. Normally, the tenure and/or promotion dossier shall include approximately six letters of evaluation from scholars whose research expertise, seniority in the profession, and prestigious appointments situate them to provide authoritative assessments of the candidate. These scholars (together with a ranked list of alternates should it be required) will be drawn from a list of five to eight scholars suggested by the candidate, supplemented by six evaluators named by the department. No more than two-thirds of the solicited letters shall be from the candidate's list. The dossier will indicate which letters were written by the candidate's chosen evaluators and which by the department's. The dean of the College of Arts and Sciences shall have the right of approval of the list.

Numerically specific criteria regarding acceptable quantity of research are inappropriate in our field, in part because of the diversity of research areas and venues for publication. Normally, the publication of a new book, monograph, or comparable coherent collection of research articles, either in print or electronic media, shall constitute an acceptable quantitative standard of research productivity for tenure and/or promotion (see paragraph one of this section). As always, the issue of scholarly merit must be of paramount importance, ahead of considerations of quantity.

Many forms of professional service (discussed below) depend on the faculty member's scholarly competence. Situations may arise when the exercise of such scholarship in professional service functions should be taken into account in evaluation of a faculty member's research. Examples include book reviews in which the author's original scholarly contributions are conspicuous or unusually broad (especially essay reviews of considerable length), or public lectures in which original research results are presented.

Service

Faculty service is comprised of Professional service and University service. **Professional service** is construed to refer to activities which are clearly and directly related to a faculty member's specific role as teacher and scholar. Examples of such activity are refereeing of proposals or manuscripts for funding agencies and organizations, journals, or publishers; editorial work on professional journals; lectures at other universities; public lectures; the organization or chairing of sessions at professional meetings; the writing of book reviews; and service on committees or as an officer in a professional society.

University service involves participation in the operation and governance of the institution. It includes membership of departmental, college, interdisciplinary, and university committees and councils, or other university bodies. Within the department, academic and career advising may have both instructional and service components; for the purpose of faculty evaluation, the department has chosen to locate programmatic advising within the confines of University service.

As with teaching and research, consideration is given to the quality as well as quantity of Professional and University service.

Tenure

To be recommended for tenure a candidate must have demonstrated excellence in teaching and research as judged according to the criteria listed above. A positive recommendation for tenure indicates in addition clear promise of continued growth as a successful teacher and of scholarly development toward favorable national recognition. Professional and university service may also be taken into account in a tenure recommendation, but such activity cannot be considered an adequate substitute for excellence in teaching and research. Favorable tenure recommendations will be made only in instances where such recommendations are consistent with the long-range priorities and goals of the department.

Each tenure-track faculty member shall receive each year a written cumulative assessment of progress toward tenure that is separate from the annual evaluation that all faculty receive. This assessment is made by the department chair in consultation with Committee A, and is based on the criteria specified in the first paragraph of this section. The chair shall discuss the

assessment with the faculty member, and a copy of the assessment will be sent to the Dean of the College.

Under the normal six-year probationary period, the department shall conduct a mid-point progress-toward-tenure assessment that includes more extensive analysis of the faculty member's performance. This will follow *mutatis mutandis* the standard tenure and promotion format, including collection of data on teaching, research, and service (when applicable), but without letters from external evaluators. Determinations regarding mid-point assessments for faculty appointed for probationary periods shorter than six years shall be made in negotiations between the faculty member, the department chair and committee 'A', and the dean.

Promotion

The essential qualifications for promotion to Associate Professor are the attainment of excellence in teaching and research as judged according to the criteria listed above, and promise for continued achievement. A positive recommendation for promotion to Associate Professor indicates clear promise of continued growth as a successful teacher and of scholarly development toward favorable national recognition. Service at the rank of Assistant Professor for any number of years is not in itself a sufficient reason for promotion. Professional and university service may be taken into account in a recommendation for promotion, but such activity cannot be considered an adequate substitute for excellence in teaching and research.

There is no specific timetable according to which faculty must be considered for promotion to Professor. In addition to the mechanisms specified in the Faculty Handbook, within the department, requests to consider promotion may be made by the faculty member or by another member of the department. To be considered for promotion to Professor a faculty member must continue to perform at a high level in both teaching and research. It is also normally expected that successful candidates for promotion to Professor have a record of significant contributions in professional and/or university service. Promotion to the rank of Professor reflects achievement of favorable national or international recognition for scholarly activity. Service at the rank of Associate Professor for any number of years is not in itself a sufficient reason for promotion.

Merit Salary Increases

Recommendations for merit salary increases will be based upon a faculty member's achievements during the preceding calendar year. There must be some flexibility in the application of this rule, for in some cases it is impossible to reward adequately someone for an achievement of the immediately preceding year. It is frequently true, for example, that the merit of some book or article may not be generally recognized until it is reviewed months, or even years, after its publication; university resources may not be sufficient in a single year to compensate adequately for an achievement recognized within a single calendar year. As in the case of tenure and promotion, teaching and research are normally the most significant factors in merit salary increase recommendations. Professional and university service are also taken into

account, but they will usually assume less significance than either teaching or research. When professional or university service are particularly time consuming *and* constructive, they may approach or equal the weights assigned to teaching or research in recommendations for merit salary increases; but this should occur only in cases where prior arrangements are agreed to as stated in the Introduction to this document.

Revised and Approved by the Provost: 18 September 1996