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1) Quality is paramount for a rating of “Excellent” in Research for tenure and promotion. Candidates who meet the quantitative criteria (as defined below) but with lesser quality may not be advanced. Candidates with truly superlative quality might be advanced with lesser quantity. It should be recognized that quantitative measures of quality, such as acceptance ratios and citation counts, are imperfect in the humanities. In-field faculty as represented by readers’ reports, external reviewer letters, and tenure and promotion committees are in the best position to judge quality and to invoke established markers that facilitate evaluation of quality.

2) Candidates in the humanities are expected to publish or have final acceptance during the tenure-earning years of a high quality, refereed scholarly monograph plus approximately 2-4 high quality, predominantly refereed book chapters or articles. In sub-disciplines that stress article production over the monograph, the candidate should have approximately 10 high quality, predominantly refereed publications. For collaborative work, the candidate’s contribution should be accounted for. Overall, the body of work should represent a coherent and well-rounded program of research. Work published prior to the tenure-earning years can be considered evidence of such a program but does not substitute for the record indicated above. Details of publications are listed below.

a. Refereed works are preferable, especially refereed journal articles and refereed book chapters. The refereed venue is one important indicator of the vetting of the quality of the research.

b. Top-tier journals are preferable, but a well-rounded record can include a variety of echelons of publications (from area specific journals to journals on pedagogy, from the oldest journal in the field to new online journals, from practitioner journals to regional/state journals).

c. This record of work can also include published works that are non-refereed but have been solicited, especially when these solicitations are indications of the prominence of the candidate’s reputation in the field.

d. Online and digital production is increasingly becoming a reality in many fields. Databases, substantive scholarly blogs, and managed websites, online journals and forums (to name a few) are welcome parts of a record. The weight and impact of this work must be made clear within the record and ideally be addressed by outside referees.

e. Non-refereed, non-solicited works can be part of a well-rounded research
record, but these works alone do not constitute “evidence of excellence” in scholarship. Encyclopedia entries and reviews, while evidence of productivity and visibility, are not normally included in the publication count unless they are lengthy entries or review essays.

3) The average length of monographs in the humanities is 90-100K words. The average length of articles is 8-10K words. Items particularly shorter or longer than average should be noted and considered as part of the well-rounded program of research. Claims about length alone do not suffice if the overall record of publication is sparse.

4) Publication of a work in two places with no, little, or some revision is both inevitable and acceptable, e.g. a journal article is published and later included in a book or collection. When the research record is sparse, however, careful scrutiny will be given to this practice.

5) Work in press counts, assuming that the candidate has a letter of final acceptance stating that all required revisions have been satisfactorily completed and the work slated for production. Should the tenure-earning period be extended beyond six years, this allowance might be reconsidered, but it should hold for now. Work “in press,” however, does not substitute for a timely and continuous rhythm of publication and productivity across the tenure-earning years. The candidate’s record should represent a pattern indicative of a lifetime of continual accomplishment and productivity with potential for high impact on the field or society.

6) At the mid-tenure review, candidates should be prepared to present their book manuscripts along with their original dissertations if revising the dissertation for publication, all drafts and research notes, manuscripts for shorter works as yet unpublished, and any correspondence with editors, journals, and presses.

7) In addition to the necessary record of publication indicated above, productivity should be demonstrated on a continuing basis by such activities as presentation at and participation in the organization of conferences, workshops, and colloquia at various levels nationally and internationally; participation on editorial boards; external and internal funding for research; invited scholarly presentation; readings; requests to review articles, book manuscripts, and grant proposals; professional offices; publicly engaged scholarship, such as museum exhibits, films, public events, and websites; and the receipt of national or international fellowships, residencies, awards, prizes, and other honors.