

**GUIDELINES FOR DEVELOPING DISCIPLINARY STANDARDS FOR SCHOLARSHIP & CREATIVE ACTIVITY
OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
STETSON UNIVERSITY**

OBJECTIVES

- 1) to articulate, in writing, disciplinary standards for scholarship and creativity by unit, division, and/or department (whichever is, on disciplinary grounds, most appropriate);
- 2) to provide greater transparency regarding standards within and outside disciplinary areas; and
- 3) to ensure reasonable equity in interpretation of standards across the university.

PRINCIPLES FOR INTERPRETING DISCIPLINARY STANDARDS

Regardless of department or division, standards should be

- appropriate to discipline and consistent with standards articulated in the University Tenure and Promotion policy adopted August 2010;
- consistent with the mission of the University as a primarily undergraduate institution with a selected number of master's programs;
- reasonable given the workload expectations at Stetson (teaching that emphasizes working closely and collaboratively with students, and participation in service/shared governance)
- consistent with standards of quality in the discipline (or interdisciplinary program/subfield in discipline);
- appropriate for an institution that aspires to have accomplished and engaged teacher-scholars and students;
- articulated within academic units that share common disciplinary practices and methodologies (may be at department or division-level; may be interdisciplinary, as, for example in the case of creative arts); and
- clearly articulated and comparable in quality/scope so as to foster equity across the disciplines.

RESOURCES AND SUPPORT

Articles, samples of disciplinary interpretations from other schools, and related resources will be made available on the Academic Affairs website, by or before October 1. The library has ordered a second copy of Ernest Boyer's *Scholarship Reconsidered*; it will be placed on permanent reserve when it arrives.

PROJECTED TIMELINE

- Fall 2010: Deans/Library Director facilitate discussion of disciplinary standards in their respective units; development and submission of documents to Dean/Library Director by 12/15.
- Spring 2011: Review of documents by Committee composed of Deans/Library Director, Associate Provost, a faculty representative from the Diversity Council, and two faculty who have recently served on the University Tenure and Promotion Committee. Documents will be reviewed for equity, consistency, quality, and adherence to governing principles. The review may generate further conversation and/or requests for revision of standards. Programs will be notified of any such requests by March 1 and will have until April 15 to respond.
- MAY 2011: Final endorsement by Deans/Library Director and submission to Provost.
- SUMMER 2011: Once approved, Disciplinary Standards for all areas posted online.

NARRATIVE OVERVIEW

Disciplinary Standards should be consistent with the high level of accomplishment and engagement to which Stetson's faculty aspires. Standards should also be reasonable given faculty workload, Stetson's primary mission as an undergraduate institution, and the expectation that faculty participate actively in service and/or shared governance. As stated in the T/P policy adopted in August 2010, Stetson recognizes all forms of scholarship that meet standards of rigor, engagement, evolution, and consistency and adhere to the tenets of the candidate's discipline for tenure and promotion to associate professor; it requires all of these plus the additional standards of maturity, development of expertise, recognition, and consistency for promotion to professor.

Interpretations of standards should be flexible enough to support the diverse (but comparably rigorous) achievements in scholarship and professional/creative activity that are recognized by and appropriate to the discipline. Resources posted on the Academic Affairs website will include models that have been recognized nationally in the disciplines: for example, Boyer's scholarship of discovery, scholarship of application, scholarship of integration, and scholarship of teaching; subsequent work that builds on Boyer's model (scholarship of engagement, etc.). Publications and statements by disciplinary associations and accrediting agencies may also be useful.

Regardless of program or department, interpretations of Disciplinary Standards should be guided by a common set of principles. They should provide clear guidance to faculty within the discipline on how their scholarly and professional/creative activities will be valued and evaluated for tenure and promotion to associate professor and promotion to full professor at Stetson. Each of the four areas below should be addressed. It is understood that expectations may vary across departments/programs, and that it is possible that some questions will be deemed inapplicable by a given department or program while others may need to be added.

WHAT EACH DISCIPLINARY STANDARDS DOCUMENT SHOULD ADDRESS:

1. Definitions/Categories

- a) What defines scholarship/professional/creative work in the discipline? What modes of scholarship are acceptable? Is quantitative and qualitative work weighted equally? (Possible resources to consult: Boyer, Rice, Diamond, disciplinary associations, accreditation agencies.)
- b) What range of tangible scholarly outcomes are recognized in the discipline (e.g., peer-reviewed articles, papers, books, conference proceedings, exhibits, performances, grants and grant proposals, conference presentations, invited lectures, etc.)?
- c) Are there interdisciplinary programs or subfields represented at Stetson or in the department/division that use different definitions or understandings of scholarship or creative activity?

2. Evaluation

- a) What criteria are used to evaluate the quality of different kinds of scholarship and professional/creative work? The quality of the venue in which scholarship is disseminated? (Speak to full range of disciplinary work, including sub-fields within departments.)

- b) In what ways might the standards of rigor, engagement, evolution, and consistency be demonstrated by faculty in the discipline and related sub-fields for tenure and promotion to associate professor? How might the additional standards (maturity, development of expertise, recognition, and consistency) be demonstrated by faculty for promotion to full professor?
- c) What are reasonable expectations for scholarly or creative activity, given Stetson's teaching load and expectations of faculty involvement in service/shared governance? For tenure and promotion to associate? For promotion to full? [Note: What's sought is not a specific number but a description of the level of accomplishment expected of candidates who might meet the standards in various combinations of scholarly works and/or creative artifacts/performances.]
- d) How is scholarship of the application, integration, and/or engagement weighted or evaluated? What are the criteria for assessing work that integrates 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 conservation project)?
- e) Under what circumstances, if any, is work begun in the dissertation (but published subsequent to the granting of the degree or faculty appointment) accepted by the discipline as suitable to include in the tenure/promotion process? How is work completed or begun in a post-doc position considered?

3. **Scope and impact**

- a) How does the discipline (or subfield) evaluate the scope (regional, national, international) and impact of scholarship and professional/creative activity?
- b) How is the quality of a sustained and ongoing program of scholarship and professional/creative activity understood and evaluated in the discipline? What are some examples of professional milestones or achievements that come with sustained effort and involvement (as an assistant professor? As an associate professor? Representing achievement sufficient for promotion to full professor?)

4. **Authorship**

- a) How does the discipline or subfield evaluate single vs. multiple author/performer in scholarship and/or creative activity?
- b) How does the discipline or subfield evaluate scholarly/professional/creative work that results from a single-study project vs. a multiple-study project (e.g., smaller vs. larger scale projects)? From quantitative vs. qualitative studies?
- c) How does the discipline evaluate scholarship and/or creative activity that involves students or is conducted collaboratively with students?