

**Tenure and Promotion Guidelines for Scholarship and Creative Activity:  
Division of Social Sciences**

**College of Arts & Sciences  
Stetson University**

Consistent with the mission of the university, the departments and programs of the Division of Social Sciences serve a tradition of liberal learning that stimulates critical thinking and imaginative inquiry in which faculty are active teacher-scholars. Economics, History, Political Science, Psychology, and Anthropology and Sociology are appointing departments of the Division of Social Sciences.

Teaching is the major emphasis in the university, but active engagement in scholarship is expected throughout the faculty member's career. For tenure and promotion considerations, the division recognizes a wide variety of scholarship. The disciplines of the Social Science division at Stetson University are not strictly uniform in their valuing of various kinds of scholarship or scholarly products. They are, nevertheless, agreed on the importance of peer review in establishing the scope and impact of scholarly outcomes. This document offers guidance on specific issues—acceptable kinds and modes of scholarship, collaborative scholarship (including collaboration with students), applied scholarship, or grant-funded work—along with commentary on divisional understandings of rigor, consistency, engagement, and evolution as standards for tenure and promotion to associate professor and rigor, engagement, consistency, and evolution as standards for promotion to full professor.

***Definitions/categories of scholarship***

The key feature for the Social Sciences is that scholarly work results in the dissemination of a product that is subject to external peer review. The simplest case is the publication of an article in a peer reviewed journal in the discipline. An external review has occurred in advance, the reviewers are clearly peers, and the response has been favorable. In other instances, the picture may be more complex. For example, the peer review might not occur until after the work is disseminated, the reviewers might be in various academic fields or professions, or the evaluation might have to be inferred from audience response, subsequent invitations extended, grant funding approved, implementation of recommended policy, copies of books sold, postings on a blog, etc. In these latter cases, the candidate and his or her colleagues should make a point of clarifying the nature of the peer review received and the resulting evaluation. Such work is not necessarily less valuable than a peer-reviewed journal article—it may be more so—but the nature of the peer review and response should be made clear enough that colleagues can understand and evaluate it. Faculty will be able to make a case for non-traditional scholarship by invoking position statements by disciplinary and related professional associations. Even in the case of a peer-reviewed article, it would be helpful to describe broader evidence of peer response—numbers of citations, requests for reprints, etc. In the Social Science Division, acceptable scholarly products include:

- Peer-reviewed journal articles
- Books (authored or edited)
- Peer-reviewed substantive reports from applied research (e.g., community-based research)

- Conference papers
- Conference posters
- Conference proceedings
- Participation on conference panels
- Grants received and grant proposals
- Invited lectures
- Book reviews
- Media articles (writing for newspapers, blogs)/media interviews related to disciplinary or interdisciplinary expertise

### ***Evaluation of scholarship***

The venue is one criterion used to evaluate the quality of different kinds of scholarship and professional/creative work. In most social science disciplines, the most highly-respected work is done for academic journals with a national and international reputation in the field. Academic books are also highly respected, especially when published by university presses and certain private publishing houses with a reputation for academic quality and integrity. Chapters in edited volumes are respected when the caliber of fellow contributors is high and, again, when the press/publisher has an established reputation. Being an editor of an edited volume would follow the same criteria as participating as a contributor, but with an extra added dose of respect for the considerable amount of work involved. For conference presentations, national conferences are ordinarily given more weight than regional or state conferences of the same type. For invited lectures, the quality/reputation of the institution or organization issuing the invitation is important. The weight and applicability of other criteria depend upon the product, but the criteria could include reviews of a book published, requests for reprints of an article, stature of the editor and co-authors of a book to which a chapter was contributed, numbers of citations of an article, etc.

Work that integrates a service/community activity with a scholar's research agenda (e.g., a faculty member collaborating with a non-profit organization on community-based research; a faculty member serving as a consultant on a local governmental project) is considered scholarship only when it is subjected to external peer review. In such cases, some effort should be made to clarify the nature of the peers. In the case of applied scholarship, a written document summarizing research findings to some contracting entity could be considered scholarship given clarification of the nature of the peers and the impact of the work.

### ***Scope and impact of scholarship***

In general, scope and impact are evaluated on the basis of the quality of the peer-reviewed venue with high-quality book publishers and journals published by professional associations given first rank. Other indicators of impact might include media coverage or awards from outside the field.

Although evaluation of scope and impact is a function of the type of scholarly activity or outcome being evaluated, some factors to consider with regards to scope and impact are the size and sophistication of the intended audience, the number of affected individuals, length of publication/presentation, extent of research effort and/or data analysis, publication quality, and comments by departmental colleagues and external reviewers.

For publications, impact can be evaluated by:

- Journal circulation (local, national, international),
- Citation analysis, and/or comments from colleagues and/or external reviewers (However, since journal impact factors are influenced by many factors, some of which are not related to journal quality per se, they should not be relied upon too heavily)
- Publication length
- Number of publications
- Quality of the journal/publisher
- Degree of research effort/data analysis, or synthesis (*e.g.*, textbooks)
- Sophistication of the employed techniques
- Colleague letters, and/or comments from external reviewers.
- Hand research awards
- Awards or recognitions from professional associations or their divisions
- Awards or recognitions from organizations outside the discipline
- Fellowships

Important in evaluating grant support are:

- The size of the award
- Competitiveness of the grant
- Number of faculty and/or students supported
- Number and prestige of internal and external collaborators
- Grants that have a positive effect on the university at-large
- Non-overhead paying grants which have significant impact at the departmental level on faculty and students, depending upon the size of the award and number of faculty/students supported
- Limited available funds might prevent worthy grant proposals from being funded. Thus, unfunded grants might also be given favorable evaluations if they receive positive feedback from reviewers.

The scope and impact of other forms of tangible scholarly outcomes can be evaluated in a similar manner, using the criteria listed under ***Definitions/categories of scholarship*** and ***Evaluation of scholarship*** above.

### ***Authorship***

Co-written works tend to be as respected as single-author works. Joint authorship is not unusual and is considered as valuable as single authorship. For works with co-authors, the promotion portfolio should include a description of the specific contribution of the individual being evaluated.

In evaluating single-study and multiple-study projects, the primary criterion is the extent to which the work furthers the discipline. Either type can do this, but the consensus in some fields seems to be that programmatic; multiple-study projects are more likely to do so. When scholarship involves empirical investigation, some behavioral sciences often value quantitative work more highly. Others in the social sciences place more emphasis on qualitative forms of investigation.

All other things being equal, a multi-stage or multi-study project should be given more weight than a single-stage or single-study project. Involvement in the former may indicate growing expertise and maturity. However, whether each *product* from a multi-stage or multi-study project is equivalent to each product from single-stage or single-study projects needs to be considered in light of the several other factors about the product (e.g., those mentioned under ***Evaluation of scholarship***, above).

The quality of scholarship and/or creative activity that involves students or is conducted collaboratively with students is evaluated in the same way as other work. However, collaborative work with students should be weighted, relative to collaborative work done with faculty members or other professional colleagues, at least as much as the latter for these reasons: It takes more work, time, and effort, because the work is not being shared between two equals. Rather, the faculty member is not only working with students to create a scholarly product, but the faculty member is also mentoring them, teaching them and honing their skill sets and thereby enhancing their marketability or qualifications for graduate or professional school, inspiring them, socializing them into the profession, etc. Collaborating with students in the production of scholarship is a mark of excellence at Stetson.

***Expectations for tenure and promotion to associate professor***

Candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor must meet the standards of **rigor, engagement, evolution, and consistency** set forth in the University Tenure and Promotion guidelines.

**Rigor:** Assistant Professors seeking tenure and promotion to associate professor must have a strong record of scholarly engagement in their field to meet the standard of **rigor**. They should be active teacher-scholars who engage in the discipline by producing some tangible scholarly outcomes with, generally speaking, a) at least two peer-reviewed research articles (for example, these could include journal articles, book chapters or articles in an edited collection, if of sufficient scholarly depth), *or*, in some cases, b) one scholarly book. Scholarly work of comparable quality, scale, and impact taking any of the various forms described in the ***Definitions*** and ***Evaluation of Scholarship*** sections above might suffice, but an explicit argument for its comparability should be made in the portfolio and/or the supporting letters.

**Consistency:** It is important that Assistant Professors show a consistent record of scholarly work (presentation of papers or posters at regional, national or international meetings) or major scholarly achievements (receiving a significant research grant; publishing an edited collection, producing written reports of applied research, etc.). A product that grows out of an assistant professor's dissertation, such as a chapter revised and published, is acceptable as long as it has been completed at Stetson.

**Engagement:** As a teacher/scholar, the candidate must demonstrate the influence of his/her scholarship on classroom instruction or on the involvement of students in research and creative activities.

**Evolution:** **Evolution** may be demonstrated by a growing body of work on a focused topic, or by work that has begun to broaden into new investigative realms and/or modes of scholarship. Scholarly outcomes should reflect the incorporation of current disciplinary/interdisciplinary

practices and that the candidate has furthered his/her own line of scholarship since arriving at Stetson. The candidate's record of scholarly activity is central to demonstrating **evolution** (interpreted here as change through time). Thus, items used to demonstrate **rigor** and **engagement** may also be used to meet this standard, as can Faculty Activity Reports (FARs).

The following scholarly activities can demonstrate **engagement** and **evolution**:

- Development of a scholarly agenda, ongoing participation in scholarly endeavors, and production of scholarly outcomes
- Serving as a workshop leader, an invited lecturer, and/or a panelist, session organizer and/or discussant at a professional conference
- Writing grant proposals
- Refereeing/reviewing grant applications
- Reviewing book manuscripts or journal articles
- Serving on an editorial board
- Serving as a resource for media outlets
- Publishing op-eds
- Engaging in community-based research or other forms of applied social research (e.g., as a principal investigator or consultant)
- Serving as a leader in professional organizations
- Attending professional conferences
- Mentoring/supervising student research projects (e.g., SURE grant recipients, senior research studies)

All items listed above can also be used to demonstrate **consistency** which involves commitment to the discipline demonstrated by continued participation, at least once per year on average, in scholarly or creative activities, such as conference participation, invited lectures, and, of course, the production of scholarly products such as those listed above under ***Definitions/categories of scholarship***. Though quality of scholarship and creative activity is more significant than quantity, candidates for tenure and promotion must demonstrate an involvement in ongoing scholarly and creative work and the ability to complete and communicate high quality work. Significant gaps in productivity should be explained in the narrative section of the portfolio.

#### ***Expectations for tenure and promotion to professor***

Candidates for tenure and promotion to Professor must meet the standards of **rigor**, **engagement**, **evolution**, and **consistency** set forth in the University Tenure and Promotion guidelines.

**Rigor:** Associate professors seeking tenure and promotion to professor must have a strong continuous record of successful implementation of a focused scholarly agenda in their field to meet the standards of rigor. Generally speaking, a book published after promotion to associate professor or at least four additional peer-reviewed articles or other scholarly works of comparable quality, scale, and impact since promotion to associate professor would be sufficient.

**Engagement:** As a teacher/scholar, the candidate must demonstrate the influence of their scholarship on classroom instruction or on the involvement of students in research and creative activities.

**Consistency:** Associate professors seeking promotion to professor must also have a continuous record of in-rank publications and other scholarly activities and products that contribute to the discipline to meet the standards.

**Evolution:** **Evolution** may be demonstrated by a growing body of work on a focused topic, or by work that has begun to broaden into new investigative realms and/or modes of scholarship. Scholarly outcomes should reflect the incorporation of current disciplinary/interdisciplinary practices and that the candidate has furthered his/her own line of scholarship since arriving at Stetson. The candidate's record of scholarly activity is central to demonstrating **evolution** (interpreted here as change through time). Thus, items used to demonstrate **rigor** and **engagement** may also be used to meet this standard, as can Faculty Activity Reports (FARs).

The activities used to demonstrate **engagement**, **evolution**, and **consistency** in the ***Expectations for tenure and promotion to associate professor*** section above also apply as expectations for promotion to professor. In addition to those examples, other evidence includes the following:

- Sustained record of scholarly endeavors and products
- Increasing depth of knowledge and expertise and honing of research skills
- Reaching larger audiences
- Hand Research Awards
- Citations of work
- Significant externally-funded grants
- Major awards or recognitions from professional associations or from their sections
- Major awards or recognitions from organizations outside the discipline
- Fellowships
- Being sought after by the media, government, or other organizations because of expertise
- A record of scholarly publications
- Letters of evaluation from reviewers or constituents regarding the significance, impact, and/or utility of scholarly products on the discipline or community

**Maturity:** **Maturity** can be demonstrated with the evidence for **evolution** under standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and by some additional evidence (invited papers or seminars, awards, and/or leadership in professional or community organizations related to scholarly expertise in a candidate's field. The continued intellectual growth in scholarly activity should clearly continue during the time since promotion to Associate. **Maturity** can also be demonstrated by invitations to serve on grant review panels, conference submission reviews and by engaging in more broad forms of scholarship, including public and private consulting. It is also demonstrated by letters of evaluation from external reviewers of scholarship as part of the promotion portfolio.

**Development of expertise:** See evidence under **rigor** and **maturity** above. Generally speaking, development of expertise is demonstrated by continued productivity involving a focused or evolving body of work that makes a meaningful contribution to the discipline and can result in solicitations for serving as a reviewer for journals or grant applications, by serving on an editorial board(s), by solicitations for TV/newspaper/telephone interviews, consulting work, invited seminars, invitations to present and/or moderate conference sessions, etc. Like maturity,

development of expertise is also demonstrated by letters of evaluation from external reviewers of scholarship as part of the promotion portfolio.

**Recognition:** The requirement for **recognition** should especially be placed in the context of the university mission and faculty teaching load. Campus, local, and regional awards are significant achievements for division faculty and can demonstrate that a candidate has been recognized for making a meaningful contribution to the discipline in a manner appropriate to the university mission. **Recognition** may also result in invitations to speak, referee, moderate conference sessions, lead professional organizations, or make media appearances to explain one's work. The quality of the peer reviewed journal or publisher of the book in which one's work appears, the competitiveness of an awarded grant, the adoption rate of books, and regional, national or international awards are all factors to consider when evaluating **recognition**. Like maturity, recognition is also demonstrated by letters of evaluation from external reviewers of scholarship as part of the promotion portfolio.

Approved by the faculty of the Social Science division, May 16, 2011  
final edits, August 2011