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INTRODUCTION
This document specifies general principles, standards, and criteria for three purposes: (1) to establish the personnel performance standards to maintain a high quality faculty and program, (2) to guide individual faculty members to pursue a successful career, and (3) to assist the Peer Review Committee (PRC), the Dean and/or University Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the President’s Designee. This document codifies the Department’s expectations and represents continuity with History Department practice in the past.

SUMMARY OF GENERAL PRINCIPLES
- The History Department believes in the model of the teacher-scholar who is actively engaged with the discipline in ways that expand understanding and knowledge among students, colleagues, and the public at large.
- The History Department sees itself as a community of teacher-scholars who work individually and collaboratively to meet Department needs in support of the College and University mission.
- Given the range of activities in which we expect achievement and the varied nature of the historical field, flexibility in evaluation is fundamentally important, and thus we do not use a quantitative approach in retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP) evaluation.
- In order to explain to those outside the discipline how professional expectations within the History Department might differ from other humanities and social sciences, this document makes reference to statements written and approved by the American Historical Association’s (AHA) “Statement on Standards of Professional Conduct” [See Appendix A]. There is no accrediting body that need be taken into account.
- The History Department affirms College and University expectations that the Candidate provide evidence in their Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) of their role as an engaged instructor, scholar, and university citizen. It also upholds the expectations of the College of Humanities, Arts, Behavioral and Social Sciences (CHABSS) RTP document that “student learning be enhanced through ’sustained excellence in teaching, research and community partnership.’”
- Regarding the assembly of the WPAF, the Candidate shall adhere to the instructions in the CHABSS RTP document and the University RTP document.
- The History Department actively encourages faculty to avail themselves of the resources and support of the Faculty Center in order to develop a strong understanding of both the evaluative and developmental aspects of the RTP process. During the probationary period, the Department encourages faculty to seek out senior faculty in the Department to provide mentorship.
GENERAL EXPECTATIONS FOR QUALITY OF PERFORMANCE

This document covers expectations for review at all levels including probationary reviews at the periodic and retention level, reviews for promotion to Associate and Full Professor, and Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty.

While specific expectations in each category of review (instruction, scholarship and creative activity, and service) are outlined below, the Department has the following general expectations for all files, in all review actions:

1. The Department values and requires engagement in all three areas of faculty performance.
2. At each evaluation, the Candidate must demonstrate proficiency in all three areas. Less than proficient performance is unacceptable to the Department.
3. Proficiency is determined through the assessment of the Candidate’s quality of contributions and engagement in each category. The quality of contributions must be evident and is based on demonstrated and consistent commitment to impactful progress in all categories of review.
4. At each evaluation, the Candidate must demonstrate a sustained record of accomplishment in all three areas.
5. At each evaluation, the Candidate must demonstrate continued growth in all three areas.

Teaching
The History Department recognizes that instruction and student learning are the core of our mission. We expect each Candidate to bring to bear his or her distinct expertise in creating, delivering, assessing and continually developing pedagogy that addresses the Department’s learning outcomes within the scope of the CHABSS and University mission. This category includes teaching classes, supervision of student research and fieldwork, advising, curriculum development, and activities by faculty in support of student learning.

The Department recognizes that faculty members who teach a wider than usual range of upper division course offerings must devote an unusually large amount of time to course preparation, and that the time spent to develop multiple teaching fields is not always reflected on the Faculty Activity Report. Therefore Candidates are encouraged to document this work in their narrative.

Standards for Instruction for Different Developmental Periods
At all levels of review, proficiency is determined by effective performance in teaching and a successful record in encouraging student learning. However we recognize that each level of review requires emphasis on the different developmental stages in a faculty member’s career.

- **Probationary Period (Periodic Evaluation and Performance/Retention Review)**
  - The Department expects probationary faculty to engage in frank critical self-reflection about pedagogy and departmental needs, and to embrace a process of development and improvement.
• We recognize the importance of experimentation and the labor involved in
constructing, employing, assessing and modifying curriculum.
• We expect faculty to enhance and extend the curriculum in the Department.

Promotion to Associate Professor, Promotion to Full Professor, Periodic Evaluation
of Tenured Faculty
• We expect a record of continued contributions to curriculum development that
demonstrates a strong understanding of the needs of the Department and various
student constituencies.
• We expect a sustained and ongoing commitment to best pedagogical practices.

Criteria for Instruction
1. Overall, the Candidate shall demonstrate an ongoing commitment to the development of
rigorous and relevant pedagogy. Teaching materials shall display familiarity with major
issues and arguments in their respective fields. The Candidate shall periodically revise
and improve syllabi reflecting factors such as their changed understanding of historical
interpretation, or their response to issues raised in student evaluations. To the degree
possible, the Candidate shall have taught a variety of courses over the period of
evaluation that contribute to the development of the History Department’s curriculum.

2. The Candidate’s teaching materials shall be appropriate to the design and level of the
course and inform students of course requirements and expected learning outcomes. The
Candidate shall clearly discuss the significance of their work in undergraduate instruction
and, where appropriate, graduate instruction, and their work in specific types of courses
(e.g. lecture, seminar, internships, independent studies).

3. The Candidate’s teaching materials shall demonstrate a commitment to a variety of
evaluative tools, including the essay, research and analytic exercises that promote active
learning, critical thinking, and written and oral expression. The Department adheres to
the AHA document on “Excellent Classroom Teaching of History.” [See Appendix B]
including the statement on “evaluation of student performance” that “although objective
testing may be useful to prompt students to read assignments, it should never represent
the bulk of student evaluation or be the final measure of student success.” The PRC shall
especially note the Candidate’s effort, development and success in fostering student
success in written communication.

4. The Candidate shall develop pedagogical and advising skills in ways that effectively
serve students at CSUSM, which is federally designated both as a Hispanic Serving
Institution and an Asian American/Native American/Pacific Islander Serving Institution.
The History Department values our diverse student body, including many who are first-
generation college students unfamiliar with academic culture. We respect our traditional
students who have been successful in college prep programs, but we also appreciate the
opportunities—and the challenges—of working with non-traditional students like
veterans, first-generation college students, reentry students, and migrant students.
5. The Candidate is encouraged to address digital technology in her/his pedagogy, assignments and syllabi, in order to help fulfill the History Department student learning outcome that students will be able to “incorporate new digital and multimedia formats into the practice and presentation of history.” The Department recognizes that not all course designs lend themselves to the use of such technology. But PRC evaluation of the Candidate will acknowledge when a course makes creative use of digital history. Similarly, with online instruction, or other course formats employing technology to deliver course content, the Department recognizes the significant time required to develop technology-based components and to keep such segments/courses current, and so PRC committees will note such effort in its evaluation.

6. The Department expects that student evaluations will, on an ongoing basis, reflect favorably on the Candidate's ability to organize and present the content of a course and successfully engage students. Evaluations that fall substantially below Department, College, and University averages on a consistent basis indicate a lack of proficiency and will generally be detrimental to the Candidate's success.

7. The Department recognizes that student evaluations may be affected by many different factors, including class size, class level, number of times the course has been taught, efforts at innovation and other circumstances. Therefore, PRCs look carefully at the entire record of student evaluations, and weigh these factors in judging evaluations.

8. A Candidate’s record should indicate a willingness to assume an individual share of departmental responsibility for undergraduate mentoring, directed studies projects, and graduate level work, whether for independent studies or thesis supervision or committee service. The Department recognizes that this work can be particularly time consuming in a way that is not fully recorded on the faculty activity report. Therefore Candidates are encouraged to document this work in their narrative.

9. The Department also values such instructionally related activities as innovative approaches to teaching and learning, directing students in internship projects on or off the campus, advising student groups in curricular or extra-curricular settings, participating in K-12 partnership groups, and developing or assisting in the development of pedagogical techniques or teaching materials related to the discipline.

10. Syllabi in the WPAF shall be accompanied by critical reflection in the narrative, and if samples of assignments or student work are presented, the reflection and analysis in the narrative must make clear what aspect of the faculty member’s pedagogy is being highlighted.

RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY
The Department of History values scholarship for what it contributes to overall historical understanding. The Department also values scholarship for what it contributes to the Candidate’s teaching and service. The Candidate’s commitment to scholarship may be demonstrated through
publication, presentation of papers at professional meetings, on-line or multimedia productions, participation in professional associations, contributions to scholarly websites/blogs, bibliographies, online databases, book reviews and significant contributions to the editing of the journals and electronically published documents in the discipline. Grants, fellowships, and awards for research and writing in the discipline are also recognized as important indicators of a candidate’s scholarly commitment.

Standards for Research/Creative Activity for Different Developmental Periods

At all levels of review, the Candidate is expected to demonstrate on-going progress in making original and significant scholarly contributions to their field that meet the university’s commitment to “high [scholarly] quality” and the college’s commitment to research “effectiveness.” In the discipline of History, this means works that reflect original and significant contributions, advance historical knowledge, and/or present new interpretative assessments of historical problems.

Periodic Evaluation/Performance and Retention Review
- The Candidate shall present a clear research agenda, explaining the evolution of the plan as needed.
- The Candidate shall present evidence of completed work, and explain how the dissemination of the work represents its merit and impact in the field.
- The proficient Candidate is making good progress toward offering an original and significant contribution to her/his field.

Promotion to Associate Professor
- Evidence of completed projects shall be provided. The Candidate shall clearly explain the significance of projects published, and/or e-published in scholarly venues, including details about review and dissemination.
- The proficient Candidate shall have made an original and significant contribution to her/his field.
- Accomplished research projects shall be evidenced with venues for scholarly dissemination and review made clear.
- The proficient Candidate shall demonstrate a sustained evolution in her/his work, either building considerably on earlier research or moving in new directions, in addition to making an original and significant contribution to the historical field.

Promotion to Professor
- Accomplished research projects shall be evidenced with venues for scholarly dissemination and review made clear.
- The proficient Candidate shall demonstrate a sustained evolution in her/his work, either building considerably on earlier research or moving in new directions, in addition to making an original and significant contribution to the historical field.

Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty (PETF)
- Research projects must be either ongoing or completed and disseminated, and demonstrate a sustained evolution from earlier work.
• Proficiency will be determined based on sustained contribution and ongoing contributions to scholarly debates within the historical field.
• PRCs reviewing the Candidate’s first PETF since promotion to associate professor and tenure shall give special attention to whether the Candidate is poised to be successful in requesting promotion to full professor. If the PRC finds that the Candidate is not yet poised to be successful, then the PRC shall make concrete suggestions.

Criteria for Demonstrating Original and Significant Scholarship and Creative Activity

Overview

The Department embraces the multi-faceted definition of scholarly work in the AHA’s statement, “Redefining Historical Scholarship” [See Appendix C].

• The advancement of knowledge through original research that results in publication as a scholarly monograph, peer-reviewed article, or conference presentation
• The integration of knowledge through review essays, encyclopedia articles, web pages, and multimedia projects
• The application of knowledge through public history/archival projects, publication of professional journals or newsletters, film consultations, participation in the grant process as an applicant, an evaluator or consultant for major grant-giving agencies, and community work in museums and advisory boards
• The transformation of knowledge concerned with teaching through such things as the writing of textbooks, articles on pedagogy, presentations to teaching conferences, documentary and/or multimedia supplements

Historians are trained specifically to work within particular chronological eras and geographical areas. Our department is comprised of scholars with expertise in diverse fields that differ in terms of methodology, content, and theory. Historical research may take many years of archival and library research, sometimes requiring considerable travel. The synthesis of research findings, in our field, often requires years of writing and revising depending upon the nature of the project. Output among historical fields is not uniform. It is the Candidate’s responsibility to provide evidence that they have made a significant and original contribution in their specific field.

Historians typically work individually. Historians do not typically coauthor with their colleagues and/or their students. We recognize that the field is currently undergoing changes and collaborative work is becoming more acceptable, which we support. However, we encourage reviewers to understand that traditionally historical research is single-authored and that this has been the hallmark of respected work. The Candidate should clearly explain the level of their contribution to a collaborative project.

The Department does not ascribe to one model of scholarly achievement. It expects the
Candidate exhibit several of different types of scholarship over time. We do not quantify the minimum number of publications required for tenure and/or promotion because of the varied nature of publication and dissemination opportunities within what comprises our diverse discipline. All of the examples of advancing historical knowledge listed above are valued, and the quality of the work and its impact on the profession, students, or the community will be given greater consideration than the work’s quantity and format.

Core Indicators of Original and Significant Scholarly Achievement in the Historical Field

These include:

1. The monograph published by an academic or commercial press is traditionally recognized as an especially significant achievement in the historical profession. Outside reviewers should know that for historians, such an achievement should be granted weight equal to multiple substantial articles.

2. Articles presenting the findings of an original research project appearing in peer-reviewed journals are significant. Again, depending on the area of historical specialization and topic, the production of a substantial article may take considerable time and effort. Hence a standard, as in common in other disciplines, based on quantity of publications does not necessarily indicate excellence. Rather the quality of the article and the journal’s reputation within the field is the standard by which a candidate’s article(s) will be assessed. It is rare in the historical field for journals to release statistics on acceptance rates. It is the responsibility of the Candidate to explain the status of the journal venue in which they have chosen to publish.

3. Chapters (invited or voluntarily submitted) in edited books published by university or commercial presses or articles published in special journal issues or conference proceedings that have undergone peer review are also regarded as significant scholarly contributions. Again, the Candidate must provide evidence documenting the status of the larger publication within the Candidate’s area of specialization.

4. Edited volumes in which the Candidate has participated as editor or co-editor (we note that normally authors are listed alphabetically rather than in order of their contributions) could also be significant. The Candidate must have contributed significantly to the overall project by authoring or co-authoring the volume’s introductory essay and other introductory portions of the collection.

5. Contributions to historical pedagogical publications could also significant. This would include authoring or co-authoring a classroom textbook or classroom reader that is published by a university or trade press. This would also include articles published in journals and/or books that have been subjected to peer review regarding historical pedagogy. The Candidate should make clear in their file their role in contributing to such publications as well as the status of such publication in the field.
6. Public History projects (archival projects and museum exhibits) could also be significant. The department affirms the a joint statement between the American Historical Association, the Organization of American Historians, and the Public History Association, which calls for PRCs to remain open to the scholarly value of such work and give it full regard. According to their joint statement “Public History scholarship, like all good historical scholarship, is peer reviewed, but that reviews includes a broader and more diverse group of peers, many from outside traditional academic departments, working in museums, historic sites, and other sites of mediation between scholars and the public.” The Candidate shall carefully explain their role in creating such projects (especially those involving collaborative teams), the scholarly impact of such projects, and the status of the venue that supports such projects.

7. Digital History projects could also be significant. However currently, the historical field has few venues or standards by which such projects are judged. Given this reality, the quality of scholarly work with digital media or in creating on-line presentations or exhibits requires additional description in the Candidate’s narrative. PRCs should remain open to the scholarly value of such work and give it full regard, while Candidates who work with digital media or on-line applications/exhibits/teaching tools should be prepared to describe the process of developing their work, to discuss its disciplinary rigor, and also to explain how it advances knowledge in significant ways. Candidates shall carefully explain their role in creating such projects (since these projects involve collaborative teams), the scholarly impact of such projects, and the status of the venue in which these projects are presented. Like Public History projects, Digital History projects should be peer reviewed but given the nature of the Digital History project, the peer group may also be drawn from academic disciplines outside of History.

The following activities are regarded as indicators of scholarly contributions but cannot stand alone or together as sole indicators of achievement. Hence the Candidate should present evidence from the core category for consideration for promotion to both the Associate and Full ranks. However PRCs should acknowledge that these activities listed below indicate progress, promise, and/or recognition of scholarly expertise.

1. Conference papers
2. Chairing conference panel
3. Book reviews or review essays
4. Contributions to encyclopedias or historical dictionaries
5. Roundtable presentations
6. Posters presented at conferences or symposiums
7. Invited lectures or talks either for the public or in educational forums
8. Expert consultation on historical projects such as films and other multimedia presentations
9. Successful grant and/or fellowship proposals
10. Participation in professional blogging related to historical topics
11. Service to professional organizations
12. Contributions to historical databases or online resources
13. Translation of scholarly work
14. Review of book and article manuscripts

SERVICE
All faculty share responsibility for service at Department, College, and University levels, and service work is fundamentally important at this public comprehensive university. The Candidate shall demonstrate appropriate quantity and quality of service work both with regard to basic workload responsibilities as well as to service work beyond that minimum expectation.

Candidates may demonstrate service through the following activities (this list represents typical examples but is not exhaustive):
- Service on assigned and elected Department committees
- Service as an elected officer of the Department
- Service on College and University-wide committees, work groups (elected, appointed, volunteer)
- Service to the community in capacities that reflect the expertise of the faculty member, e.g., local history, senior groups, or K-12 presentations
- Authorship, or shared authorship, of major Department, College, or University documents, e.g., program or policy reviews or faculty council bylaws
- Organizing outreach or mentoring student interns
- Advising a student group
- Mentoring of faculty
- Mentoring undergraduate students or graduate students (on campus; off campus)
- Office held/participation in professional organizations
- Service award, fellowship, or honor

Standards for Service for Different Developmental Periods

Periodic Evaluation, Performance/Retention Review, and Promotion to Associate Professor
- The Candidate shall demonstrate an increasing engagement in service activities during the period preceding request for promotion. Evidence of impactful contributions and an active presence in service indicates proficiency at this level of review.
- The Candidate shall demonstrate an increasing understanding of the importance of service, and her/his particular service contributions, to the Department, College and beyond as a fundamental component of the tenure-track faculty position.
- The proficient Candidate shall demonstrate an evolving service profile of assuming more responsibility and leadership either formally, as evidenced in chairing a committee or other kinds of designated leadership roles, or informally, through major and impactful contributions to the Department, College, University and/or larger community.
Promotion to Professor

- The proficient Candidate shall demonstrate an evolving service profile of assuming more responsibility and leadership either formally, as evidenced in chairing a committee or other kinds of designated leadership roles, or informally, through major and impactful contributions to the Department, College, University and/or larger community.

Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

- The proficient Candidate should demonstrate a sustained record of active engagement and impact in campus service.

Criteria for Service

1. Regarding service in the Department, the Candidate’s record should demonstrate a willingness to assume an individual share of departmental work (through committees, panels and other departmental initiatives). The Candidate’s record should also demonstrate a willingness to assume an individual share of representing the Department on College and University committees.

2. The Department values service activities where the Candidate contributes to shared governance by consciously building upon her/his (1) academic expertise and (2) interest in specific university and community needs. All service work cited by the Candidate must be demonstrated to serve the College and University mission.

3. The Candidate shall explain, and provide appropriate evidence, of the impact of her/his service. The Candidate should demonstrate how her/his skills and interests have contributed to the impact of her/his service work.
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Introduction

Under its 1889 charter from the U.S. Congress, which specifically authorizes the American Historical Association to act “in the interest of American history, and of history in America,” the AHA bears a special obligation to address principles of conduct and practice among historians. Thus, in 1974 the Association established the Professional Division, the profession’s only elected body specifically charged with responsibility for ethical concerns, and in 1987 the Professional Division, in turn, drafted the *Statement on Standards of Professional Conduct* to serve as the benchmark for all professional behavior within the historical profession.

This wholly revised edition of the *Statement on Standards* is the most comprehensive revision of the document since its development. The most important revisions include:

- Streamlining the text to impose a more uniform style and voice on the whole, without sacrificing or altering any of the important statements of principle it contains.
- Addressing the entire profession to be more inclusive of the full range of professional historians working in many different institutional settings.
- Speaking to common values by opening with two new sections, “The Profession of History” and “Shared Values of Historians.”
- Consolidating policies to synthesize and integrate AHA guidelines concerning professional conduct as they have evolved over the years.

The Professional Division and the AHA Council believe that the *Statement on Standards of Professional Conduct* will be of use not just to professional historians, but also to students, journalists, employers, scholars in allied fields, and anyone interested in questions pertaining to ethical conduct in the practice of history. They urge individuals to share this document, whether by ordering additional copies, photocopying this publication, or linking to the online version at www.historians.org.
Statement on Standards of Professional Conduct


This Statement on Standards of Professional Conduct addresses dilemmas and concerns about the practice of history that historians have regularly brought to the American Historical Association seeking guidance and counsel. Some of the most important sections of this Statement address questions about employment that vary according to the different institutional settings in which historians perform their work. Others address forms of professional misconduct that are especially troubling to historians. And some seek to identify a core set of shared values that professional historians strive to honor in the course of their work.

1. The Profession of History

History is the never-ending process whereby people seek to understand the past and its many meanings. The institutional and intellectual forms of history’s dialogue with the past have changed enormously over time, but the dialogue itself has been part of the human experience for millennia. We all interpret and narrate the past, which is to say that we all participate in making history. It is among our most fundamental tools for understanding ourselves and the world around us.

Professional historians benefit enormously from this shared human fascination for the past. Few fields are more accessible or engaging to members of the public. Individuals from all backgrounds have a stake in how the past is interpreted, for it cuts to the very heart of their identities and world views. This is why history can evoke such passion and controversy in the public realm. All manner of people can and do produce good history. Professional historians are wise to remember that they will never have a monopoly on their own discipline, and
that this is much more a strength than a weakness. The openness of the discipline is among its most attractive features, perennially renewing it and making it relevant to new constituencies.

What, then, distinguishes a professional historian from everyone else? Membership in this profession is defined by self-conscious identification with a community of historians who are collectively engaged in investigating and interpreting the past as a matter of disciplined learned practice. Historians work in an extraordinary range of settings: in museums and libraries and government agencies, in schools and academic institutions, in corporations and non-profit organizations. Some earn their living primarily from employment related to the past; some practice history while supporting themselves in other ways. Whatever the venue in which they work, though, professional historians share certain core values that guide their activities and inform their judgments as they seek to enrich our collective understanding of the past. These shared values for conducting and assessing research, developing and evaluating interpretations, communicating new knowledge, navigating ethical dilemmas, and, not least, telling stories about the past, define the professional practice of history.

2. Shared Values of Historians

Historians strive constantly to improve our collective understanding of the past through a complex process of critical dialogue—with each other, with the wider public, and with the historical record—in which we explore former lives and worlds in search of answers to the most compelling questions of our own time and place.

Historians cannot successfully do this work without mutual trust and respect. By practicing their craft with integrity, historians acquire a reputation for trustworthiness that is arguably their single most precious professional asset. The trust and respect both of one’s peers and of the public at large are among the greatest and most hard-won achievements that any historian can attain. It is foolish indeed to put them at risk.

American Historical Association
Although historians disagree with each other about many things, they do know what they trust and respect in each other’s work. All historians believe in honoring the integrity of the historical record. They do not fabricate evidence. Forgery and fraud violate the most basic foundations on which historians construct their interpretations of the past. An undetected counterfeit undermines not just the historical arguments of the forger, but all subsequent scholarship that relies on the forger’s work. Those who invent, alter, remove, or destroy evidence make it difficult for any serious historian ever wholly to trust their work again.

We honor the historical record, but understand that its interpretation constantly evolves as historians analyze primary documents in light of the ever-expanding body of secondary literature that places those documents in a larger context. By “documents,” historians typically mean all forms of evidence—not just written texts, but artifacts, images, statistics, oral recollections, the built and natural environment, and many other things—that have survived as records of former times. By “secondary literature,” we typically mean all subsequent interpretations of those former times based on the evidence contained in primary documents. This distinction between primary and secondary sources is among the most fundamental that historians make. Drawing the boundary between them is a good deal more complicated than it might seem, since determining whether a document is primary or secondary largely depends on the questions one asks of it. At the most basic level, though, the professional practice of history means respecting the integrity of primary and secondary sources while subjecting them to critical scrutiny and contributing in a fair-minded way to ongoing scholarly and public debates over what those sources tell us about the past.

Honoring the historical record also means leaving a clear trail for subsequent historians to follow. This is why scholarly apparatus in the form of bibliographies and annotations (and associated institutional repositories like libraries, archives, and museums) is so essential to the professional practice of history. Such apparatus is valuable for many reasons. It enables other historians to retrace the
steps in an argument to make sure those steps are justified by the sources. Apparatus often evaluates evidence to indicate gaps in the historical record that might cast doubt on a given interpretation. Knowing that trust is ultimately more important than winning a debate for the wrong reasons, professional historians are as interested in defining the limits and uncertainties of their own arguments as they are in persuading others that those arguments are correct. Finally, the trail of evidence left by any single work of history becomes a key starting point for subsequent investigations of the same subject, and thus makes a critical contribution to our collective capacity to ask and answer new questions about the past. For all these reasons, historians pride themselves on the accuracy with which they use and document sources. The sloppier their apparatus, the harder it is for other historians to trust their work.

The trail of evidence in bibliographies, notes, museum catalogs, databases, and other forms of scholarly apparatus is crucial not just for documenting the primary sources on which a work of history depends, but the secondary sources as well. Practicing history with integrity means acknowledging one's debts to the work of other historians. To copy the work of another and claim it for one's own is plagiarism—an act historians abhor. Plagiarism violates the historical record by failing to reveal the secondary sources that have contributed to a given line of argument. It is a form of fraud, and betrays the trust on which the historical profession depends. Much more will be said about it later in this Statement on Standards.

Among the core principles of the historical profession that can seem counterintuitive to non-historians is the conviction, very widely if not universally shared among historians since the nineteenth century, that practicing history with integrity does not mean being neutral or having no point of view. Every work of history articulates a particular, limited perspective on the past. Historians hold this view not because they believe that all interpretations are equally valid, or that nothing can ever be known about the past, or that facts do not matter. Quite the contrary. History would be pointless if such claims were true, since its most basic premise is that within certain limits
we can indeed know and make sense of past worlds and former times that now exist only as remembered traces in the present. But the very nature of our discipline means that historians also understand that all knowledge is situated in time and place, that all interpretations express a point of view, and that no mortal mind can ever aspire to omniscience. Because the record of the past is so fragmentary, absolute historical knowledge is denied us.

Furthermore, the different peoples whose past lives we seek to understand held views of their lives that were often very different from each other—and from our own. Doing justice to those views means to some extent trying (never wholly successfully) to see their worlds through their eyes. This is especially true when people in the past disagreed or came into conflict with each other, since any adequate understanding of their world must somehow encompass their disagreements and competing points of view within a broader context. **Multiple, conflicting perspectives are among the truths of history.** No single objective or universal account could ever put an end to this endless creative dialogue within and between the past and the present.

What is true of history is also true of historians. Everyone who comes to the study of history brings with them a host of identities, experiences, and interests that cannot help but affect the questions they ask of the past and the answers they wish to know. When applied with integrity and self-critical fair-mindedness, the political, social, and religious beliefs of historians can appropriately inform their historical practice. Because the questions we ask profoundly shape everything we do—the topics we investigate, the evidence we gather, the arguments we construct, the stories we tell—it is inevitable that different historians will produce different histories.

For this reason, historians often disagree and argue with each other. That historians can sometimes differ quite vehemently not just about interpretations but even about the basic facts of what happened in the past is sometimes troubling to non-historians, especially if they imagine that history consists of a universally agreed-upon accounting of stable facts and known certainties. But universal
agreement is not a condition to which historians typically aspire. Instead, we understand that interpretive disagreements are vital to the creative ferment of our profession, and can in fact contribute to some of our most original and valuable insights.

Frustrating as these disagreements and uncertainties may be even for historians, they are an irreducible feature of the discipline. In contesting each other’s interpretations, professional historians recognize that the resulting disagreements can deepen and enrich historical understanding by generating new questions, new arguments, and new lines of investigation. This crucial insight underpins some of the most important shared values that define the professional conduct of historians. They believe in vigorous debate, but they also believe in civility. They rely on their own perspectives as they probe the past for meaning, but they also subject those perspectives to critical scrutiny by testing them against the views of others.

Historians celebrate intellectual communities governed by mutual respect and constructive criticism. The preeminent value of such communities is reasoned discourse—the continuous colloquy among historians holding diverse points of view who learn from each other as they pursue topics of mutual interest. A commitment to such discourse—balancing fair and honest criticism with tolerance and openness to different ideas—makes possible the fruitful exchange of views, opinions, and knowledge.

This being the case, it is worth repeating that a great many dilemmas associated with the professional practice of history can be resolved by returning to the core values that the preceding paragraphs have sought to sketch. Historians should practice their craft with integrity. They should honor the historical record. They should document their sources. They should acknowledge their debts to the work of other scholars. They should respect and welcome divergent points of view even as they argue and subject those views to critical scrutiny. They should remember that our collective enterprise depends on mutual trust. And they should never betray that trust.
3. Scholarship

Scholarship—the discovery, exchange, interpretation, and presentation of information about the past—is basic to the professional practice of history. It depends on the collection and preservation of historical documents, artifacts, and other source materials in a variety of institutional settings ranging from libraries to archives to museums to government agencies to private organizations. Historians are committed to protecting significant historical evidence wherever it resides. Scholarship likewise depends on the open dissemination of historical knowledge via many different channels of communication: books, articles, classrooms, exhibits, films, historic sites, museums, legal memoranda, testimony, and many other ways. The free exchange of information about the past is dear to historians.

Professional integrity in the practice of history requires awareness of one’s own biases and a readiness to follow sound method and analysis wherever they may lead. Historians should document their findings and be prepared to make available their sources, evidence, and data, including any documentation they develop through interviews. Historians should not misrepresent their sources. They should report their findings as accurately as possible and not omit evidence that runs counter to their own interpretation. They should not commit plagiarism. They should oppose false or erroneous use of evidence, along with any efforts to ignore or conceal such false or erroneous use.

Historians should acknowledge the receipt of any financial support, sponsorship, or unique privileges (including special access to research material) related to their research, especially when such privileges could bias their research findings. They should always acknowledge assistance received from colleagues, students, research assistants, and others, and give due credit to collaborators.

Historians should work to preserve the historical record, and support institutions that perform this crucial service. Historians favor free, open, equal, and nondiscriminatory access to archival, library, and museum collections wherever possible. They should be careful to avoid any actions that might prejudice access for future
historians. Although they recognize the legitimacy of restricting access to some sources for national security, proprietary, and privacy reasons, they have a professional interest in opposing unnecessary restrictions whenever appropriate.

Historians sometimes appropriately agree to restrictive conditions about the use of particular sources. Certain kinds of research, certain forms of employment, and certain techniques (for instance, in conducting oral history interviews) sometimes entail promises about what a historian will and will not do with the resulting knowledge. Historians should honor all such promises. They should respect the confidentiality of clients, students, employers, and others with whom they have a professional relationship. At much as possible, though, they should also strive to serve the historical profession’s preference for open access to, and public discussion of, the historical record. They should define any confidentiality requirements before their research begins, and give public notice of any conditions or rules that may affect the content of their work.

4. Plagiarism

The word plagiarism derives from Latin roots: plagiarus, an abductor, and plagiarare, to steal. The expropriation of another author’s work, and the presentation of it as one’s own, constitutes plagiarism and is a serious violation of the ethics of scholarship. It seriously undermines the credibility of the plagiarist, and can do irreparable harm to a historian’s career.

In addition to the harm that plagiarism does to the pursuit of truth, it can also be an offense against the literary rights of the original author and the property rights of the copyright owner. Detection can therefore result not only in sanctions (such as dismissal from a graduate program, denial of promotion, or termination of employment) but in legal action as well. As a practical matter, plagiarism between scholars rarely goes to court, in part because legal concepts, such as infringement of copyright, are narrower than ethical standards that guide professional conduct. The real penalty for plagiarism is the abhorrence of the community of scholars.
Plagiarism includes more subtle abuses than simply expropriating the exact wording of another author without attribution. Plagiarism can also include the limited borrowing, without sufficient attribution, of another person’s distinctive and significant research findings or interpretations. Of course, historical knowledge is cumulative, and thus in some contexts—such as textbooks, encyclopedia articles, broad syntheses, and certain forms of public presentation—the form of attribution, and the permissible extent of dependence on prior scholarship, citation, and other forms of attribution will differ from what is expected in more limited monographs. As knowledge is disseminated to a wide public, it loses some of its personal reference. What belongs to whom becomes less distinct. But even in textbooks a historian should acknowledge the sources of recent or distinctive findings and interpretations, those not yet a part of the common understanding of the profession. Similarly, while some forms of historical work do not lend themselves to explicit attribution (e.g., films and exhibitions), every effort should be made to give due credit to scholarship informing such work.

Plagiarism, then, takes many forms. The clearest abuse is the use of another’s language without quotation marks and citation. More subtle abuses include the appropriation of concepts, data, or notes all disguised in newly crafted sentences, or reference to a borrowed work in an early note and then extensive further use without subsequent attribution. Borrowing unexamined primary source references from a secondary work without citing that work is likewise inappropriate. All such tactics reflect an unworthy disregard for the contributions of others.

No matter what the context, the best professional practice for avoiding a charge of plagiarism is always to be explicit, thorough, and generous in acknowledging one’s intellectual debts.

All who participate in the community of inquiry, as amateurs or as professionals, as students or as established historians, have an obligation to oppose deception. This obligation bears with special weight on teachers of graduate seminars. They are critical in shaping a young historian’s perception of the ethics of scholarship. It is therefore incumbent on graduate teachers to seek opportuni-
ties for making the seminar also a workshop in scholarly integrity. After leaving graduate school, every historian will have to depend primarily on vigilant self-criticism. Throughout our lives none of us can cease to question the claims to originality that our work makes and the sort of credit it grants to others.

The first line of defense against plagiarism is the formation of work habits that protect a scholar from plagiarism. The plagiarist’s standard defense—that he or she was misled by hastily taken and imperfect notes—is plausible only in the context of a wider tolerance of shoddy work. A basic rule of good note-taking requires every researcher to distinguish scrupulously between exact quotation and paraphrase.

The second line of defense against plagiarism is organized and punitive. Every institution that includes or represents a body of scholars has an obligation to establish procedures designed to clarify and uphold their ethical standards. Every institution that employs historians bears an especially critical responsibility to maintain the integrity and reputation of its staff. This applies to government agencies, corporations, publishing firms, and public service organizations such as museums and libraries, as surely as it does to educational facilities. Usually, it is the employing institution that is expected to investigate charges of plagiarism promptly and impartially and to invoke appropriate sanctions when the charges are sustained. Penalties for scholarly misconduct should vary according to the seriousness of the offense, and the protections of due process should always apply. A persistent pattern of deception may justify public disclosure or even termination of a career; some scattered misappropriations may warrant a formal reprimand.

All historians share responsibility for defending high standards of intellectual integrity. When appraising manuscripts for publication, reviewing books, or evaluating peers for placement, promotion, and tenure, scholars must evaluate the honesty and reliability with which the historian uses primary and secondary source materials. Scholarship flourishes in an atmosphere of openness and candor, which should include the scrutiny and public discussion of academic deception.
5. Teaching

Teaching is basic to the practice of history. It occurs in many venues: not just classrooms, but museums and historic sites, documentaries and textbooks, newspaper articles, web sites, and popular histories. In its broadest definition, teaching involves the transmission of historical knowledge to people who do not yet have such knowledge. Whether it occurs in the classroom or the public realm, it performs the essential work of assuring that the past remains a part of living memory in the present.

Good teaching entails **accuracy and rigor** in communicating factual information, and strives always to place such information in context to convey its larger significance. Integrity in teaching means presenting competing interpretations with fairness and intellectual honesty. Doing so can support one of the most important goals of teaching: exciting the interest of those who are encountering a new historical topic for the first time, leading them toward the insight that **history is a process of living inquiry**, not an inert collection of accepted facts.

The **political, social, and religious beliefs** of history teachers necessarily inform their work, but the right of the teacher to hold and express such convictions can never justify falsification, misrepresentation, or concealment, or the persistent intrusion of material unrelated to the subject of the course. Furthermore, teachers should be mindful that students and other audience members have the right to disagree with a given interpretation or point of view. Students should be made aware of multiple causes and varying interpretations. Within the bounds of the historical topic being studied, the free expression of legitimate differences of opinion should always be a goal. Teachers should judge students’ work on merit alone.

Course offerings, textbooks, and public history presentations should address the diversity of human experience, recognizing that historical accuracy requires attention both to individual and cultural similarities and differences and to the larger global and historical context within which societies have evolved. The American
Historical Association is on record as encouraging educational and public history activities to **counter harassment and discrimination** on campuses and in the public realm. It encourages administrators to speak out vigorously against such incidents. At the same time, the Association disapproves of efforts to limit or punish free speech. We **condemn the violation of First Amendment rights to free speech**, as well as the harassment and vilification to which individuals have sometimes been subjected for exercising these rights.

### 6. History in the Public Realm

Because **interpreting the past is so vital to democratic debate and civic life** in the public realm, historians regularly have the opportunity to discuss the implications of their knowledge for concerns and controversies in the present—including present controversies about past events. It is one of the privileges of our profession to share historical insights and interpretations with a wider public, wherever the locus of our employment. We should welcome the chance to do so, and the institutions that employ historians should recognize the importance of this aspect of our work. Historians should not be subject to institutional or professional penalties for their beliefs and activities, provided they do not misrepresent themselves as speaking for their institutions or their professional organizations when they are not authorized to do so.

Practicing history in the public realm presents important challenges, for when historians communicate with a wider public, they must represent not just a particular interpretation or body of facts, but the best practices of the discipline of history itself. This means they must inevitably walk a tightrope in balancing their desire to present a particular point of view with their responsibility to uphold the standards and values that underpin their professional authority as historians. This challenge can be especially complex for public historians, whose daily working lives frequently require multiple levels of accountability, and for historians working in advocacy roles.
Public discussions of complex historical questions inevitably translate and simplify many technical details associated with those questions, while at the same time suggesting at least some of the associated complexities and divergent points of view. While it is perfectly acceptable for historians to share their own perspectives with the public, they should also strive to demonstrate how the historical profession links evidence with arguments to build fair-minded, nuanced, and responsible interpretations of the past. The desire to score points as an advocate should never tempt a historian to misrepresent the historical record or the critical methods that the profession uses to interpret that record.

Historians who work in government, corporate, and nonprofit institutions, as well as those occasionally entering public arenas as political advisers, expert witnesses, public intellectuals, consultants, legislative witnesses, journalists, or commentators, may face a choice of priorities between professionalism and partisanship. They may want to prepare themselves by seeking advice from other experienced professionals. As historians, they must be sensitive to the complexities of history, the diversity of historical interpretations, and the limits as well as the strengths of their own points of view and experiences and of the discipline itself. In such situations, historians must use sources, including the work of other scholars, with great care and should always be prepared to explain the methods and assumptions in their research; the relations between evidence and interpretation; and alternative interpretations of the subjects they address.

7. Employment

The American Historical Association firmly supports fairness and due process in all decisions involving the appointment, promotion, and working conditions of historians. Institutions should develop published rules governing their employment practices, and it should go without saying that they should follow these rules.

Although some historians are self-employed, most work for academic institutions, corporations, government agencies, law firms, archives, historical societies, museums, parks, historic preservation programs, or other institutions. To the extent they can influence the policies
and practices of their workplace, the AHA encourages historians to do whatever they can to persuade their institutions to accept and enforce rules to ensure equity in conditions of employment. If they work in an academic institution, they should urge it to accept the 1966 Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities, jointly formulated by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), the American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.

Fairness begins with recruitment. Historians have an obligation to do all possible to ensure that employment opportunities in the field are widely publicized and that all professionally qualified persons have an equal opportunity to compete for those positions. This means not only the placement of job notices in appropriate publications (for example, the AHA’s Perspectives on History) but also the inclusion in such notices of a completely accurate description of the position and of any contingencies, budgetary or otherwise, that might affect the continued availability of the position. An institution should not deceive possible candidates by omitting qualifications or characteristics that favor certain candidates over others (for example, a preference for unspecified minor fields). If an employer decides to alter a job description or selection criteria, the institution should re-advertise. The AHA strongly discourages institutions from charging application fees for post-doctoral fellowships and other positions, since these discriminate against candidates whose financial resources are limited.

Fairness also involves equal treatment of all qualified applicants and procedures that are considerate to all applicants. For example, an employing institution should promptly acknowledge all applications and, as soon as practicable, inform applicants who do not meet the selection criteria. Likewise, it should keep competitive applicants informed of the progress of the search and promptly notify those who are no longer under consideration. It should do everything possible to accommodate finalists in arranging interviews, including the payment of expenses, where appropriate. Finally, it should ensure that those who conduct interviews adhere to professional standards by respecting the dignity of candidates, focusing their questions on the qualifications needed for the position, and avoiding questions that violate federal or state antidiscrimination laws.
Employment decisions always involve judgments. But, except in those cases in which federal law allows a specific preference, institutions should base hiring decisions as well as all decisions relating to reappointment, promotion, tenure, apprenticeship, graduate student assistantships, awards, and fellowships solely on professional qualifications without regard to sex, race, color, national origin, sexual orientation, religion, political affiliation, veteran status, age, disability, or marital status. A written contract should follow a verbal offer in a timely manner, and institutions have an obligation to explain as clearly as possible the terms of such contracts. Once signed, a contract should be honored by all parties as both a legal and ethical obligation. Employers have an obligation to clarify all rules and conditions governing employment and promotion.

Once employed, any person deserves the professional respect and support necessary for professional growth and advancement. Such respect precludes unequal treatment based on any nonprofessional criteria. In particular, it precludes any harassment or discrimination, which is unethical, unprofessional, and threatening to intellectual freedom. Harassment includes all behavior that prevents or impairs an individual’s full enjoyment of educational or workplace rights, benefits, environment, or opportunities, such as generalized pejorative remarks or behavior or the use of professional authority to emphasize inappropriately the personal identity of an individual. Sexual harassment, which includes inappropriate requests for sexual favors, unwanted sexual advances, and sexual assaults, is illegal and violates professional standards.

Historians should receive promotions and merit salary increases exclusively on the basis of professional qualifications and achievements. The best way to ensure that such criteria are used is to establish clear standards and procedures known to all members of the institution. An institution should have an established review process, should offer candidates for promotion or merit raises opportunities to substantiate their achievements, should provide early and specific notification of adverse promotion or salary decisions, and should provide an appeal mechanism.
Of particularly grave concern to historians are those institutional decisions that lead to disciplinary action—most important, questions of suspension and dismissal, because they may involve issues of intellectual freedom. All institutions employing historians should develop and follow clearly written procedures governing disciplinary action. These procedures should embody the principles of due process, including adequate mechanisms for fact-finding and avenues for appeal. Academic institutions should adhere to the AAUP’s 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure. Other institutions that employ professional historians should provide a comparable standard of due process.

Historians who work part time or off the tenure track should receive compensation in proportion to the share of a full-time work load they carry, including a proportionate share of fringe benefits available to their full-time colleagues; they also should have access to institutional facilities and support systems, and appropriate involvement in institutional governance.

8. Reputation and Trust

Historians are obligated to present their credentials accurately and honestly in all contexts. They should take care not to misrepresent their qualifications in resumes, applications, or the public record. They should apply the same rigor and integrity in describing their own accomplishments as their profession applies to the historical record itself.

The status of a book, article, or other publication that is still in the production pipeline is often an important piece of information for search committees, tenure/promotion review committees, and fellowship committees. Yet the profession has no standardized terminology for works in progress, often rendering their status unclear. The AHA suggests the following lexicon.

- “In Press”: the manuscript is fully copyedited and out of the author’s hands. It is in the final stages of the production process.
“Forthcoming”: a completed manuscript has been accepted by a press or journal.

“Under contract to . . .”: 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.

Historians should not list among the completed achievements on their resumes degrees or honors they have never earned, jobs they have never held, articles or books they have never written or published, or any comparable misrepresentations of their creative or professional work.

Historians should be mindful of any conflicts of interest that may arise in the course of their professional duties. A conflict of interest arises when an individual’s personal interest or bias could compromise (or appear to compromise) his or her ability to act in accordance with professional obligations. Historians frequently encounter such situations as participants in some form of peer review—for example, reviewing grant applications, vetting manuscripts for publication, evaluating annual meeting program proposals, or selecting prize or award recipients. Historians should identify and, where appropriate, recuse themselves from any decisions or other actions in which a conflict of interest or the appearance thereof arises; they should avoid situations in which they may benefit or appear to benefit financially at the expense of their professional obligations. An individual should normally refuse to participate in the formal review of work by anyone for whom he or she feels a sense of personal obligation, competition, or enmity.
9. Additional Guidance

This Statement on Standards of Professional Conduct offers general guidance about core values and practices of the historical profession. Because no document of this sort could ever be comprehensive, the AHA typically amends this Statement only when some new issue arises that is of such general concern that a formal policy declaration seems warranted.

For additional advice about ethics and best practices among professional historians, readers are urged to consult other declarations and publications of the American Historical Association, including best practice statements and wise counsel documents readily available on the AHA web site.

Valuable insights can also be gleaned from the publications of several other historical associations, for instance, the Ethics Guidelines of the National Council on Public History; the Statement of Professional Standards and Ethics of the American Association for State and Local History; the Evaluation Guidelines of the Oral History Association; and the Principles and Standards for Federal Historical Programs of the Society for History in the Federal Government, among others.

We encourage all historians to uphold and defend their professional responsibilities with the utmost seriousness, and to advocate for integrity and fairness and high standards throughout the historical profession.
APPENDIX B. AHA, Statement on Excellent Classroom Teaching of History (1998)


The Teaching Division and the Council of the American Historical Association endorse the criteria presented in the following statement as an appropriate basis for evaluating the efforts of institutions at all levels of instruction to establish the prerequisite conditions for historians to provide excellent instruction. There are, of course, a number of important issues for which there are many viable solutions that make specific criteria, at least at this point, seem inadvisable. For example, this statement does not address which courses should form the basis of historical study or provide such specific measures as a precise student-faculty ratio in the classroom. Instead, the Teaching Division and the Council expect faculty and administrators to consider together the areas where their institutions meet, exceed, or fall short of these baseline criteria for excellence. Evidence and analysis rather than unsupported assertion should characterize these discussions. The American Historical Association, its staff, elected officers, and members stand ready to help departments work through these issues and to support historians in instances where these criteria are clearly not implemented by an institution. The statement was drafted by David Trask (Guilford Technical Community Coll.), AHA Council member sitting on the Teaching Division 1994-97.

Introduction

1. Course Content
2. Historical Thinking
3. Classroom Environment
4. Evaluation of Student Performance

Introduction

American citizens are currently engaged in wide-ranging debates on educational policies affecting all venues where teaching and learning occur. These discussions have or can have significant impact on the teaching of history and, therefore, on the nation and its understanding of history in the coming decades. Some of these discussions seek to define the course work done by students by prescribing curriculums. Others focus on financial support for education and can lead to decisions to downsize departments by increasing instructional loads and class sizes or by mandating new formats for instruction. There are debates that address the relationship among different teaching settings by mandating, for example, that course work taken at community colleges automatically transfer to public senior colleges. States and regions are also exploring the expansion of new modes of instruction such as Internet use. All of these issues and others ultimately affect the environment for learning history--both its content and its perspectives on the past.

The need to reevaluate instruction--both its content and its techniques--is not a new development for historians. Teaching historians have a long, effective record of discussing and analyzing different classroom settings to assure that they are delivering the best historical understandings
with the most effective teaching methods. Traditionally this analysis has been done informally by individuals or formally by departments; few efforts have reached beyond the boundaries of home campuses. In periods of strong institutional budgets, numerous students, and a supportive public, these efforts were sufficient. Recently the environment for teaching has changed. Legislatures are seeking undefended dollars for new programs; citizen interest in career-specific education is increasing; there are efforts to prescribe what should be taught in the classroom.

Historians must respond to this interest in educational assessment by developing approaches that measure the development of historical thinking and knowledge. Historians need to address these challenges by developing clear criteria that inform decision makers--both on and beyond campus--of those characteristics of historical study that are fundamental to students' formulation of meaningful historical perspectives. By facilitating the assessment of proposed budget realignments and the evaluation of new teaching technologies, these criteria will help society determine the long-term impact of policy alternatives on the nation's sense of the historical and on student abilities to deal with social and political data and issues. By adopting these criteria, departments will be able to clarify for themselves how well, individually and collectively, they are achieving their teaching goals. Traditional measures of instructional quality--basic teaching skills, faculty availability to students, a well thought-out syllabus--are necessary but by themselves no longer sufficient for assuring that the conditions for effective teaching and learning exist. Although the missions of educational institutions may vary, the American Historical Association affirms that legislatures, governing boards, school administrators, and historians must work together to ensure that the criteria listed below are clearly present in their history courses for both majors and nonmajors and are supported by the institution's operations and environment.

1. **Course Content.** All courses must contain sufficient factual material to enable students to understand the central themes and issues present in the course. Factual material must be based on the most recent research findings. Historical research has expanded our understanding of the past in dramatic ways over the last 20 years, and this process continues. History instructors must have opportunity and motivation to integrate relevant results in their course content. Historical facts should be treated, however, as the beginning rather than the final goal of historical study. Courses must explicitly present the analytical concepts characteristic of historical study. These concepts not only underlie the questions that historians ask of the past, they help historians organize evidence, evaluate its relation to other evidence, and determine the relative importance of different events in shaping the past--and the present. These concepts address sequence, change over time, cause and effect, the role of factors such as culture and technology in shaping the history of the period, and the importance of the insights of all major social and cultural groupings in the society being studied. A true examination of the past requires attention to the full range of human activities and institutions, including politics, society, culture, economy, intellectual trends, and international relations.

2. **Historical Thinking.** Textbooks and well-delivered lectures sometimes give students the impression that the study of history is the quest for the single correct answer, because these end products of study conceal the historian's struggle with the indeterminacy associated with conflicting evidence and multiple viewpoints. For this reason excellent historical courses go beyond the presentation of content and analytical concepts to provide students with multiple
opportunities to do the work of the historian. Students need to be aware of the kinds of sources used by historians, and they should become adept at extracting meaning from these sources, comparing their findings with other evidence from the period, formulating conclusions about the issue under study, and testing these ideas against additional evidence and the ideas of other historians. Students should be taught to think historically, to have the opportunity to develop their own historical interpretations, because this transforms their formal study of the past into a true understanding of the ways that conflicting evidence, alternative perspectives, and society's concerns shape our evaluations of the past. For these reasons students should be given frequent opportunities for discussion and writing in order to learn to practice the art of interpretation and to see the implications of their own analyses. These experiences should be progressive with the work at each level or grade, building on the studies that students carried out in prior courses. Historical thinking also contributes to the important educational goals of producing a thoughtful citizenry and of providing individuals with the analytical skills suitable to a wide range of jobs.

3. Classroom Environment. The classroom environment must actively promote the learning of history. This includes the presence of an adequate supply of relevant and up-to-date maps and audiovisual materials as well as the necessary equipment. The number of students per class must not exceed the number that can carry on meaningful interactions over course issues. The reliance on large lecture sections must be accompanied by discussion sections that are small enough so that the instructor can realistically expect oral participation by all students. Alternative forms of instruction, such as television or the Internet, must also require significant communication between students and faculty and among students themselves. In addition students must be presented with the special issues related to the use of these technologies such as "visual literacy" with regard to film and "authority" in the evaluation of Internet sources. Instructor loads must not exceed the ability of the teacher to offer excellent instruction and to keep up-to-date with the latest research. Adjunct faculty should be held to the same expectations as full-time faculty and should receive the same institutional supports as faculty with continuing appointments. Although it is reasonable to expect that some historians will hold positions that involve duties in addition to teaching history, these instructors must be required to meet the same instructional standards as full-time teaching historians and must be supported in their work in the same way as full-time historians.

4. Evaluation of Student Performance. Although objective testing may be useful to prompt students to read assignments, it should never represent the bulk of student evaluation or be the final measure of student success. Because the work of the excellent history course revolves around analysis and interpretation, student evaluation must be based on written or other work that allows students to develop and present their own analyses--on tests, oral presentations, papers, or group projects. This should include student research projects in which the students seek out and weigh appropriate factual information and use it to answer significant historical questions at a level of difficulty appropriate to their level of study.
APPENDIX C. AHA – Redefining Historical Scholarship (1993)

Report of the American Historical Association Ad Hoc Committee on Redefining Scholarly Work

December 1993

Despite considerable differences in institutional missions and goals, most American colleges and universities agree on the basic criteria for faculty tenure and promotion decisions: the documentation and evaluation of research, teaching, and service. Although the relative weight given to each of the three criteria varies considerably from institution to institution, critics maintain that too much emphasis is now placed on the research component, with the other two relegated to considerably lesser if not irrelevant status. For example, Ernest Boyer of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching maintains that this equation of scholarship with research and publication, while perhaps having served many faculty and institutions well over the years, has perpetuated narrow individual and institutional priorities at odds with the broader interests of faculty and with the varied needs of colleges and universities today. In Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities for the Professorate (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990), Boyer argues that "a wide gap now exists between the myth and the reality of academic life. Almost all colleges pay lip service to the trilogy of teaching, research, and service, but when it comes to making judgments about professional performance, the three rarely are assigned equal merit. ... the time has come to move beyond the tired old 'teaching versus research' debate and give the familiar and honorable term 'scholarship' a broader, more capacious meaning, one that brings legitimacy to the full scope of academic work." (pp. 15-16)

This debate over priorities is not discipline-specific but extends across the higher education community. Nevertheless, each discipline has specific concerns and problems. For history, the privilege given to the monograph in promotion and tenure has led to the undervaluing of other activities central to the life of the discipline--writing textbooks, developing courses and curricula, documentary editing, museum exhibitions, and film projects to name but a few. Despite a number of efforts within recent years to give greater recognition to such work, a traditional, hierarchical conceptualization of what constitutes historical scholarship, based on the German university model, continues to dominate and restrict our profession's rewards structure. There is little recognition of the diverse interests and talents of today's historians or of the changes that they undergo over the course of their careers. The situation is unlikely to change until we as a profession consciously rethink the fundamental meaning of historical scholarship and the role of the historian as scholar today. While frustration over the academic rewards structure may be the catalyst, a re-examination of the meaning of scholarship has much larger implications for the profession--if scholarly activity is central to the work of our profession, then how we define scholarship determines what it means to be a historian and who is part of the historical community. The AHA defines the history profession in broad, encompassing terms, but is that definition meaningful as long as only certain kinds of work are valued and deemed scholarly within our discipline? If the historical profession is a broad community of individuals committed to "teaching, researching, writing, or otherwise providing or disseminating historical knowledge and understanding" (Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Future of the AHA, 1988, p. 1),
then the virtually exclusive identification of historical scholarship with the monograph is inappropriate and unfairly undervalues the work of a significant portion of professional historians. Just how many historians are excluded by a narrow definition of scholarship? According to data from a 1985-86 study conducted by the American Council of Learned Societies, only 41.8 percent of historians surveyed have published one or more scholarly books or monographs during their careers.

**The AHA Ad Hoc Committee**

Within this context, the American Historical Association agreed in 1991 to participate in two initiatives that call for the development of discipline-specific redefinitions of scholarly work. The first, conducted by Syracuse University and supported by the Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education and the Lilly Endowment, focuses on enhancing the status of teaching within the faculty rewards system. Eighteen professional associations are taking part in this effort. In the second project, eleven professional associations have agreed to undertake a variety of efforts to increase recognition for scholarship-based professional service. The cosponsors of this project are the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, the University of Maryland at College Park, and Wayne State University, with support from the Johnson Foundation. Those two projects have in turn contributed to a third initiative in which the Association has taken part, the Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards sponsored by the American Association for Higher Education and funded by the Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education.

The Association's agreement to take part in these projects rested on five assumptions:

- That problems associated with the faculty rewards system are not discipline-specific. Hence, individual disciplines and their associations may be a good place to start, but they cannot be expected to bring about reform single-handedly. Similar initiatives must be launched within higher education associations and college and university administrations if there is to be any substantial change.
- That the AHA's role should not be to prescribe a certain formula but rather to suggest alternative ways of conceptualizing scholarly work and to provide examples of the different ways in which history departments have addressed this issue. The emphasis should be on what "can be" considered scholarship, not what "must be" or "is." Any statement from the Association must be adaptable to the varied needs of different departments and institutions and leave room for individual and institutional choices.
- That a redefinition of scholarly work should not diminish or undermine historical research but rather extend and enhance it. Nor should a redefinition lead to a competitive situation--the relationship of research to other scholarly work should be viewed as complementary not competitive. Research--as well as teaching--remains at the heart of the profession.
- That the Association's concern is with historians' activities that relate directly to their research and teaching, broadly defined, and not with public service, civic involvement, or other service to their institutions and communities. While the latter are valuable and should be encouraged, they do not draw upon the historian's professional or disciplinary expertise and cannot be characterized as scholarly.
- That reform efforts should focus on increasing flexibility within the system and avoid the imposition of additional requirements on already over-burdened tenure-track faculty. Moreover, priorities should change concomitantly in institutional support for faculty. The point should be to change priorities and increase options, not to demand more or increase faculty workloads.

Rather than addressing the two issues (teaching and service) separately, the AHA decided to combine the two efforts into one and develop a more comprehensive statement on the nature of scholarly work and the structure of the tenure and rewards system. Toward that end an ad hoc committee was convened, composed of:
A Conceptual Framework

An essay by Eugene Rice, Antioch College, entitled "The New American Scholar: Scholarship and the Purposes of the University," provided the context for the ad hoc committee's work. The Rice essay provides an alternative conceptualization of scholarly work: he proposes that the trilogy of research, teaching, and service be abandoned in favor of a more inclusive four-part definition of scholarship. In so doing, the discussion broadens from issues of balance within the campus-defined function of professor to the larger roles and obligations of the scholar. Drawing on the work of Ernest Boyer, Sandra E. Elman, Ernest Lynton, Lee Shulman, and others, Rice breaks scholarship down into four distinct yet interrelated components:

- The advancement of knowledge--essentially original research
- The integration of knowledge--synthesizing and re-integrating knowledge, revealing new patterns of meaning and new relationships between the parts and the whole
- The application of knowledge--professional practice directly related to an individual's scholarly specialization
- The transformation of knowledge through teaching--including pedagogical content knowledge and discipline-specific educational theory

Rice concludes:

We know that what is being proposed challenges a hierarchical arrangement of monumental proportions--a status system that is firmly fixed in the consciousness of the present faculty and the academy's organizational policies and practices. What is being called for is a broader, more open field where these different forms of scholarship can interact, inform, and enrich one another, and faculty can follow their interests, build on their strengths, and be rewarded for what they spend most of their scholarly energy doing. All faculty ought to be scholars in this broader sense, deepening their preferred approaches to knowing but constantly pressing, and being pressed by peers, to enlarge their scholarly capacities and encompass other--often contrary--ways of knowing. (p. 6)

An Expanded Definition of Historical Scholarship

The ad hoc committee then applied this framework to the history discipline, using as a starting point the following passage from the AHA's Statement on Standards of Professional Conduct (1992): Scholarship, the uncovering and exchange of new information and the shaping of interpretations, is basic to the activities of the historical profession. The profession
communicates with students in textbooks and classrooms; to other scholars and the general public in books, articles, exhibits, films, and historic sites and structures; and to decision-makers in memoranda and testimony. (p. 5)

That description is clearly broader than the traditional definition of scholarship as original research, and it provided the committee with the basis for developing an expanded list of activities appropriate for consideration under a more inclusive tenure and promotion system. The list that follows is basically an inventory of activities that can be scholarly but does not address when a particular activity is scholarly and when it is not—that is an issue of evaluation, as discussed below. For example, teaching can be a scholarly activity but all teaching is not scholarly in nature.

Using the Rice formulation of scholarship, the committee proposes that within history:

The advancement of knowledge includes:

- Original research—based on manuscript and printed sources, material culture, oral history interviews, or other source materials—published in the form of a monograph or refereed journal article; disseminated through a paper or lecture given at a meeting or conference or through a museum exhibition or other project or program; or presented in a contract research report, policy paper, or other commissioned study
- Documentary or critical editions
- Translations

The integration of knowledge includes:

- Synthesis of scholarship—published in a review essay (journal or anthology), textbook, newsletter, popular history, magazine, encyclopedia, newspaper, or other form of publication; disseminated through a paper or lecture given at a meeting or conference or through a museum exhibition, film, or other public program; or presented in a contract research report, policy paper, or other commissioned study
- Edited anthologies, journals, or series of volumes comprised of the work of other scholars

The application of knowledge includes public history, specifically:

- Public programming (exhibitions, tours, etc.) in museums and other cultural and educational institutions
- Consulting and providing expert testimony on public policy and other matters
- Contract research on policy formulation and policy outcomes
- Participation in film and other media projects
- Writing and compiling institutional and other histories
- Historic preservation and cultural resource management
- Administration and management of historical organizations and institutions
- Archival administration and the creation of bibliographies and databases
- Professional service—editing journals and newsletters, organizing scholarly meetings, etc.
- Community service drawing directly upon scholarship—through state humanities councils (e.g., public lectures), history day competitions, etc.

The transformation of knowledge through teaching includes:

- Student mentoring/advising
- Research, writing, and consulting in history education and in other disciplines allied to history
While the charge to the committee was to develop a discipline-specific definition of scholarly work, the above formulation would be applicable as well to interdisciplinary work by historians. The committee did not address, however, the relative value of or weight that should be given to such work.

Weighting, Documentation, and Evaluation

As indicated earlier, this list of activities should not be viewed as prescriptive or definitive but rather as suggestive of how historical scholarship can be redefined to be more inclusive and multidimensional. While the breakdown provides a good starting point for departmental reassessment of promotion and tenure criteria, any such effort must also take into account the mission and goals of the individual department and the institution of which it is a part. Even if a department adopts the redefinition, it must still determine for itself the appropriate balance among the four components and the relative weight to be assigned to each. A central question that every department should address is whether there is a single mix or balance that each individual within the department must achieve or whether there is room for individuals to weight categories of work differently, as long as the department overall achieves a balance consistent with its mission.

But agreeing on an appropriate definition of scholarly work is only the first step—implementation is impossible without the development of appropriate strategies for documentation and evaluation. Work that cannot be documented and evaluated does not merit reward. But how is the work to be documented? It is relatively simple to provide copies of books or articles produced as part of one's research, but how is an innovative classroom activity or a museum exhibit documented? Advocates of the redefinition of scholarly work maintain that scholarship is strengthened when other activities are included, but it is difficult to demonstrate scholarly quality and rigor when documentation involves no more than counting or identifying. New forms of documentation such as portfolios and reflective essays must be implemented.

Attention also must be given to peer review and evaluation. Who will evaluate this scholarship? Do you require outside reviewers for teaching as you do for research? How do you secure the reviewers needed to evaluate work outside the usual expertise of faculty, such as museum exhibitions and computer software? What will be the criteria for evaluation? In a presentation on "What Makes It Scholarly" at a Conference on Redefinition and Assessment of Scholarship sponsored by Syracuse University in 1992, Ernest Lynton suggested that evaluation criteria might include: the expertise informing the choices made, the appropriateness and effectiveness of the choices, the originality and degree of innovation manifested in the activity, the difficulty of the task accomplished, and the scope and importance of the activity. Lynton's criteria focus on the process of scholarship rather than the product, thus encompassing a wider range of work than the monograph or journal article. For an example of how documentation and evaluation has been

As each department or institution develops or adopts standards and criteria appropriate to its own mission and goals, the problem of transferability from one institution to another arises--will a scholar with nontraditional credentials find his or her mobility restricted? It is likely, for example, that the most prestigious research universities will continue to weight those activities classified under "advancement of knowledge" very heavily in appointment and promotion decisions. Thus senior members of a department have an obligation to counsel junior colleagues not only about the criteria for promotion in his or her own institution but also about the realities which govern advancement in the profession beyond that institution.

For further discussion of these issues (weighting, documentation, and evaluation) within the broader higher education context, see Robert M. Diamond and Bronwyn E. Adam, eds., *Recognizing Faculty Work: Reward Systems for the Year 2000* (Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1993); Russell Edgerton, Patricia Hutchings, and Kathleen Quinlan, *The Teaching Portfolio: Capturing the Scholarship in Teaching* (American Association for Higher Education, 1991); Sandra E. Elman and Sue Marx Smock, *Professional Service and Faculty Rewards: Toward an Integrated Structure* (National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, 1985); and Ernest A. Lynton and Sandra E. Elman, *New Priorities for the University* (Jossey-Bass, 1987). Each addresses both theory and practice and provides additional bibliographic citations. The Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards of the American Association for Higher Education has assembled a resource packet that includes not only a bibliography of articles and monographs but also a list of unpublished campus documents that address issues of faculty priorities and the reward system. Contact the Forum at the AAHE offices, One Dupont Circle. Suite 360, Washington, DC 20036-1110, 202/293-6440.

**Case Studies in Faculty Roles and Rewards**

For a discussion of these tenure and promotion issues within the specific context of the history profession, see the April 1988, October and December 1989, and June 1991 issues of *The OAH Council of Chairs Newsletter* and the spring 1993 issue of *The Public Historian*. The first and the last provide discussions of promotion and tenure within the context of public history, and the 1991 issue of the *Newsletter* focuses on evaluating teaching. The other two issues present case studies of policies and procedures at eight very different public and private colleges and universities, including a two-year senior college, three general baccalaureate institutions, two comprehensive institutions, and two doctoral- level universities. Moreover, the departments vary in terms of the highest degree offered--five offer the B.A., two the M.A., and one the Ph.D.--and in size--from ten to nearly thirty faculty each. These articles provide both valuable illustrations of alternative faculty rewards systems and direction in addressing documentation and evaluation questions.

The pertinent articles from *The OAH Council of Chairs Newsletter* are:

From the April 1988 issue:
• Kendrick A. Clements, "Promotion and Tenure for Public Historians"

From the October 1989 issue:

• Donald R. Whitnah, "Faculty Evaluation at the University of Northern Iowa"
• Raymond G. Herbert, "Faculty Evaluation at Thomas More College"
• Charles P. Carlson, Jr., "Faculty Evaluation at the University of Denver"
• Louise E. Hoffman, "Faculty Evaluation at Pennsylvania State University at Harrisburg"

From the December 1989 issue:

• Robert W. McAhren, "Teaching Evaluation at Washington and Lee University"
• Charles R. Bailey, "Assessing Teaching Effectiveness at SUNY-Geneseo"
• Carol S. Gruber, "Evaluating Teaching at William Paterson College"
• Anthony O. Edmonds, "The Evaluation and Reward of Teaching: Confessions of a Department Head Who Agreed to Chair a Blue Ribbon Committee on Evaluating Teaching"

From the June 1991 issue:

• Russell Edgerton, "The Teaching Portfolio-- Recognizing the Scholarship in Teaching"
• Peter Seldin and Linda F. Annis, "The Teaching Portfolio"
• John Barber, "The Teaching Portfolio: At Last, a Panacea"
• Anthony O. Edmonds, "The Teaching Portfolio: A Personal Witness by a Department Chair"
• James Wilkinson, "Documenting Feedback in the Teaching Portfolio"

From The Public Historian: