

Academic Personnel Guidelines Proposed by UC History Department Chairs (4/20/11)

The Chairs of the History Departments of the University of California met on January 28, 2011 to discuss shared challenges, prospects for collaboration, and the state of the field in the UC system. At that meeting the Chairs formulated joint positions, for the guidance of colleagues and those entrusted with academic personnel decisions, on three issues.

I. Research in Digital and Electronic Form

- 1) With regard to the publication of electronic books and articles in electronic journals: evaluation must be based on rigorous peer review. Electronic books and articles of high merit deserve recognition as significant intellectual contributions on the same order as printed material. (Non-refereed digital publications, including blogs, may be considered public outreach and part of the service profile).
- 2) With regard to the construction of digital archives or other digital research resources: evaluation must be based on substantive merit (according to the same criteria obtaining for printed scholarship) and technical merit (which may require a different expert evaluator). Digital archives and similar materials of high merit deserve recognition as significant contributions to knowledge on the order of scholarly editions.
- 3) With regard to applications or digital platforms with embedded coding and significant functionality: evaluation must be based on substantive and technical merit. Applications and similar materials of high merit provide important support to scholars and deserve recognition as significant contributions to knowledge (for example, *Zotero*, developed by the Center for History and New Media at George Mason University).
 - i. Those engaged in (2) and (3) should provide documentation of the digital project (its creation, intended audience, and projected impact) in the form of a project Website or, ideally, a publication directed toward a scholarly audience.
 - ii. Because most projects in categories (2) and (3) are collaborative, participating scholars should clearly define their particular roles (APM 210-1.d.2).

II. E-Books in Tenure and Promotion Cases

The Chairs affirm that scholarly work considered in tenure and promotion cases can come in a variety of forms. The most salient criterion remains superior intellectual attainment in research, analysis, and execution, attested to by rigorous peer review. E-books that meet this standard provide an appropriate foundation for promotion.

III. Promotion to Professor

Promotion to Full Professor recognizes substantial and ongoing contributions to historical knowledge. The Chairs affirm that there are multiple pathways to promotion to Full Professor, while also affirming the essential standard of high-quality scholarly production.

The Chairs recognize that norms vary at different campus in the UC system, but nonetheless agree on the following principles:

1) For cases in which the significant contribution takes the form of a second monograph, the Chairs recommend flexibility in the expected time frame of completion, since significant historical research typically requires extensive work in (sometimes distant) archives. First books in the humanities often require up to ten years of dissertation and post-doctoral labor; producing a second book within the six years normatively assigned associate professors at UC is therefore sometimes challenging. To accommodate this reality, we believe that Associate steps IV and V may be used regularly and productively to recognize ongoing progress on a book manuscript, rather than being seen as exceptional, problematic or punitive.

2) Promotion may be considered on the basis of a significant but partially completed second book, together with the ongoing publication of high-quality articles.

3) The Chairs also agree that, in some cases, promotion may be granted on the basis of a body of high-quality substantial articles and book chapters that are drawn from original research and make a major contribution to a field, comparable to that made by a significant monograph.

Susan Amussen, UC Merced

John Majewski, UC Santa Barbara

Mary Elizabeth Berry, UC Berkeley

David Myers, UCLA

David Biale, UC Davis

Pamela Radcliff, UC San Diego

Randolph Head, UC Riverside

Jeff Wasserstrom, UC Irvine

Gail Hershatter, UC Santa Cruz