

Memorandum

To: Department Chairs

From: The Professional Status Committee

Date: March, 2009

Re: Guidelines for revising departmental scholarship statements

Background. In the fall of 2006 the Professional Status Committee sent to each department a document (“Expectations for Scholarship at Calvin College”) that explained what PSC members saw as the strengths and weaknesses of the departmental scholarship statements—and the challenges in revising those statements. Since then the PSC has received several revised departmental statements and has received feedback on statements from deans, department chairs, and colleagues who have been through reappointment processes. Based on what the PSC has learned, the committee now presents the attached guidelines.

When departments were first asked to craft scholarship statements, they were given four questions to answer: What do research and scholarship mean to your department? How do research and scholarship contribute to the total mission of your department? What methods should be used to evaluate research and scholarship in your department? How will your department promote research and scholarship?

Changes. The new guidelines retain most of the content of those four questions. The three main changes between the original and the current guidelines are (1) to ask more specific questions in each category, (2) to include questions about student research, and (3) to include a category on “expectations for colleagues.”

The urgent problem. The third of those changes is most critical. Too often individual colleagues and PSC members have found too little clear direction in departmental statements. Colleagues might have to guess what is expected of them based on what other recent candidates have accomplished for reappointments. PSC members must often guess why one department’s idea of commendable scholarship seems so different from another’s.

A clear scholarship statement is, therefore, essential. The college now has ample experience in using scholarship statements and assessing their effectiveness. So the categories, questions, and examples that are attached are sent by PSC in the hopes of improving intra- and interdepartmental conversations about scholarship as well as clarifying individual reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions.

Timing and process. Departments that will undergo external review in the next two years will revise their scholarship statements for those reviews. Departments that are hiring or conducting reappointment, tenure, and promotion reviews will want to revise their statements as soon as possible for the benefit of the individual colleagues who will be affected. Departments with recently-revised statements should review their statement against the new guidelines. Each department should arrange a schedule with its academic dean for when the department will want to bring a revised scholarship statement to PSC.

The academic deans, the dean for research and scholarship, and the PSC are always willing to help with departmental conversations about scholarship statements and with the review of drafts. As the PSC receives revisions of departmental statements, it advises the academic deans to communicate to departments responses and directions for further revision. If you have any questions, please contact your divisional academic dean.

Guidelines for Departmental Scholarship Statements

Calvin has consistently expected that faculty be engaged in scholarship, nurturing and exercising a professional disposition to be engaged in the conversations of our professions—and to be shaping those conversations through participation. Calvin faculty have also been urged to practice and demonstrate effective habits of life-long learning, believing that effective teaching is, in large part, a result of eager and ongoing learning.

Most Calvin faculty strongly affirm the importance of scholarship, but individuals and departments sometimes face difficulty defining their unique scholarly efforts to those outside their field. Although the peer-reviewed publication remains the standard for most people in most departments, for other colleagues performances, artistic or technical products, or professional consultancies are essential forms of scholarship (each with unique forms of peer review).

Consequently, there will necessarily and appropriately be differences among the departmental statements, but to balance uniqueness with consistency, each departmental scholarship statement should address the five categories under “Content for Departmental Scholarship Statements” and the key questions under each heading. The “examples” cited at the end of each of the five parts of the “Content” section are what PSC members believe are especially effective parts of some current departmental statements. The examples should influence by inspiration rather than constraint. (Copies of the examples are appended to this document.)

Rhetorical Contexts for Departmental Scholarship Statements: Audiences and Purposes

The two primary audiences for the departmental statements are the colleagues in your department and members of the PSC.

Departmental colleagues need to know what is expected of them and how they will be supported in achieving and reporting on expectations.

PSC members need to understand what your department expects, to be assured that your departmental expectations are in harmony with college expectations, and to be taught the reasons for particular expectations in your department.

Content for Departmental Scholarship Statements

1. Importance of scholarship (These questions ask for definitions and foundational concepts—to serve as context for the specifics in categories 2-5.)

- What is the role of scholarship in your department? And how does your department’s answer to that question fit the college’s statements regarding scholarship (*Handbook* 3.6.3.2)?
- How does your department define traditional scholarship in each field in your department (e.g., traditional scholarship in the Music Department includes performance), and what kinds of non-traditional scholarship (e.g., Boyer-model categories) might be appropriate?
- How does your department discuss connections between scholarship and teaching?
Examples: *French*, “Limits of the terms, *research* and *scholarship*”; *Classics*, “Research and the Classroom”; *Art*, “What Do Research and Scholarship Mean to the Art Department?”; *Education*, “The Meaning of Scholarship and Research”

2. Expectations of colleagues (These are the “What will be on the test?” questions, the specifics that your colleagues and PSC need to understand.)

- How does your department introduce colleagues to your department’s scholarship statement and help colleagues to interpret the statement?

- What specific activities and products—in terms of variety, quality, and quantity—does your department expect? What general activities and products—in terms of contributions to scholarly conversations, demonstration of scholarly habits of mind, etc.—does your department expect?
- What does your department expect at each reappointment review: first, second, tenure, promotion to full? How do you offer specific guidelines that help colleagues to demonstrate appropriate progress toward tenure and promotion?
- How are the expectations for each individual in your department established in context of the scholarly activity of the whole department?
- In what ways does your department expect colleagues' scholarship to be informed by and reflective of their faith?
- If your department varies from most departments at Calvin in its expectations, what is the nature of and the rationale for the variation? How is the variation reasonable and necessary?
Examples: *English*, “Benchmarks”; *Chemistry*, “Expectations of the Faculty . . .”; *French*, “Appendix”; *Physics*, “Hypothetical Models of Achievement”

3. Evaluation of scholarship (These are questions about methods and aims of evaluating scholarship.)

- How does your department assess quantity and quality of scholarship?
- How does your department include some type of peer review in evaluation?
- How does your departmental statement teach the PSC about measures of quantity and quality in your discipline?
Examples: *CAS*, “Methods of Evaluation”; *Philosophy*, “The Importance of Quality”; *Social Work*, “What methods should be used . . . ?”

4. Student research (This question has become necessary because every department encourages—and many departments expect—faculty-student research.)

- What expectations does your department have for involving students in research? And how does your department measure and credit research with students?
Examples: *Math*, appendix on “Undergraduate Research”

5. Departmental support for scholarship (The assumption behind these questions is that the college must support what it expects, and that support begins in the department.)

- How does your department support colleagues in achieving expectations for scholarship?
- What kinds of support are offered at each reappointment review and throughout the reappointment and promotion process?
- Who is accountable for ongoing support?
- What mentoring is in place?
- What other forms of guidance and feedback does your department offer?
- How are the forms of support initiated and maintained strategically from a first tenure-track appointment through promotion to full professor?
- How does your department help colleagues to write the scholarship section of their self-assessments for reappointment, tenure, and promotion reviews?
Examples: *Sociology*, “How will the department promote research and scholarship?”; *Biology*, “Matrix 2, Individuals Who Can Help . . .”

Examples from Current Departmental Statements

(The brief note that precedes each example explains what in particular the PSC finds effective about the example.)

1. Importance of scholarship

“The limits of the terms *research* and *scholarship*” (In this pair of paragraphs the French Department clarifies what it does and does not include in its definition of research and scholarship.)

For the French Department, scholarship and research refer to critical engagement with the ideas, perspectives, practices and paradigms in one’s field and in surrounding cultures.

For the purposes of this document, the Department of French distinguishes “critical engagement with ideas” from the activities of maintaining professional competence, whether these activities constitute a linguistic retooling or an updating of cultural perceptions. Such activities, while essential components of our duties as faculty members, nevertheless lie outside the parameters of this statement.

“Research and the classroom” (The Classics Department here offers a helpful and witty discussion of the relationship between teaching and scholarship, and in so doing the statement also expands the products of scholarship beyond just publication.)

The Classics Department sees its research and scholarly activities as being closely connected with its function as a teaching department. For example, Bratt’s archaeological research has produced most of the department’s library of over 18,000 slides and supplied most of the content for Classics 221 and several interim courses. Williams has published studies of Catullus, Aristophanes, Julius Caesar, Aristotle, and RATHERIUS OF VERONA in refereed journals, as well as books on Aristotle’s logic and Aelred’s *Spiritual Friendship*; most of these works grew out of questions raised by students and colleagues. Gustafson has studied the intersection between Roman and Christian cultures, and Harding is engaged in a study of that most central phenomenon of ancient life, rhetoric.

Since each of us typically teaches seven or eight different courses annually, maintaining currency in all the fields within classical studies is a high priority for us, especially since we are all called upon to teach literally each of the 29 courses in our catalogue sooner or later. (It should be noted here that Calvin offers one of the most extensive classics programs among US undergraduate colleges.) So far as we are concerned, then, the connection between our scholarly activities and our work in the classroom is and ought to be very close. A sign in the Vatican microfilm library sums up our opinion nicely: “Research is to teaching what sin is to confession: without the one you have little to say in the other.” We do not wish to press the analogy between sin and research too far; but we would regard any attempt to separate the scholarly from the pedagogical enterprise as misguided and ultimately detrimental to the mission of Calvin College.

What Do Research and Scholarship Mean to the Art Department? (This section of the Art and Art History Department’s statement clarifies—especially for PSC members—the variety of types of faculty member—and thus the variety of kinds of scholarship—in the department.)

The art faculty do research and scholarship in the visual arts through various activities. Such activities begin through a dynamic engagement with the current ideas, issues, and methodologies of contemporary visual art in culture. The Department of Art is currently undergoing something of a paradigm shift from a rather insular approach focused on the audiences encompassed by the church and Christian schools related to Calvin College. The department is shifting to broader concerns in contemporary society. Calvin College is already the premier art department in the Christian College Coalition and a leader in the Christians in: the Visual Arts. The department is now challenged to move beyond these communities to become one of the top art programs in Michigan regardless of religious affiliation.

At present three groups of faculty serve the Department of Art. The three areas of concentration include studio (including design communication), history and architecture, and education. Professional scholarly production varies accordingly.

Studio artists produce art as their major scholarly contribution. Each artist will engage the historical and critical developments and debates in her or his medium of expertise and will produce original work.

The art historian’s research and scholarship requires engagement with the scholarship of other art and/or architectural historians, art critics, artists, philosophers, anthropologists, and well beyond as well.

Art educators are required to engage the current philosophical stances in general education, in art education theories, issues and practices, and the current political scene as it affects education. In addition they will produce works of art and/or engage current issues in art history and criticism.

Calvin College faculty members are to perform well in four areas: teaching, advising, community service, and scholarship. Research and scholarship done for audiences outside the college vary with each faculty member's field of expertise. In the past, much of what has been called scholarship in the arts could just as well be called community service, for it focused primarily on serving the needs of the Church and the Christian community through exhibitions at Calvin College, church lectures and commissions, and lectures to Christian schools, participation in Christians in the Visual Arts, and articles for the Banner. While not neglecting these audiences, we are committed to more active involvement in professional organizations and broader venues as appropriate to our specialties.

Local participation is defined as West Michigan and includes such institutions as the Grand Rapids Art Museum, the Urban Institute for Contemporary Art, and the Muskegon Museum of Art, unless the local institution is sponsoring an event which is national in scope. Regional participation is defined as the MidWest, unless the regional organization or institution is sponsoring an event which is national in scope. Though geographically international, the Christians in the Visual Arts will be treated as a regional organization for purposes of evaluating scholarly contributions. Local and regional participation has typically included service on boards and committees, as well as exhibiting, lecturing, or writing for local and regional art competitions or exhibitions.

National and international scholarly participation will include membership in professional organizations and contributions to them by writing, speaking, and exhibiting. Such organizations for art faculty include the College Art Association, National Council on Education for the Ceramic Arts, National Art Education Association, American Society for Aesthetics, Michigan Art Education Association, and Historians of Netherlandish Art.

Contributions to these groups may be historical, philosophical, or technical. The faculty is expected to present where submissions are subject to peer review and selection.

“The Meaning of Scholarship and Research” (By framing scholarship with the notions of purpose and audience, the Education Department creates a thorough and practical set of definitions.)

The Education Department broadly defines scholarship in education as critical engagement with the ideas, perspectives, practices, and paradigms in the field of education, including both as an academic discipline and as a professional, institutional practice in the surrounding culture (society). As such scholarship is viewed as a shaping force of thinking about and acting in the area of education. Within this broad understanding of scholarship, the education department elaborates scholarship by describing it in terms of purpose and in terms of audience. The two are not mutually exclusive; instead, they are orthogonal to each other.

Defining Scholarship by purpose:

The Education Department differentiates between types of scholarship in terms of three different possible purposes, where a purpose refers to the intended focus or aim of the scholarship. These purposes align with those outlined in The Expanded Mission Statement of Calvin College. The three purposes that define scholarship in the education department are as follows:

- Conserving scholarship involves developing a continued understanding of the reformed (Christian) tradition's thought about education, both in terms of Christian education as well as public, with an eye to energize and set direction for the department's ongoing work and research. This includes:
 - imaginatively reappropriating and rearticulating aspects of the tradition to address current issues in educational thought and practice;
 - extending the ideas of the tradition to new areas of education.
- Transforming scholarship involves providing a critique of current theories and practices prevalent in education with an eye to showing the critical, redemptive or reconciling power of the Christian faith in that field. This includes:
 - establishing Christian-based criteria and critique for what constitutes knowledge in the discipline and practice of education;
 - doing empirical research based on Christian criteria, where hypotheses are identified, methodology is selected, data are collected, analysis is provided, conclusions are drawn, which might challenge dominant thinking in the field;
 - implementing Christian-based criteria in the field of education with an eye to making positive changes in the actual practice of education;
 - synthesizing a number of strands of findings provided in the literature, developing a coherent approach or set of practices such that the synthesis may be understood by the educational practitioner in the field;
 - making connections across disciplines, placing specialties in larger contexts, illuminating data and positions in new ways, often for non-specialists.

- Enriching scholarship involves bringing insights or methods of the field of education to bear on our Christian-based thought and understanding of education, including self-criticism, with an eye to enhancing and enriching its testimony as a Christian message. This includes:
 - engaging in empirical research to contribute to a cutting-edge problem in the field of education;
 - providing a critique to current thought and practices of Christian education or education generally in light of new research and thought;
 - providing intra-institutional leadership in areas such as more effective and life-affirming pedagogical methodologies, instructional techniques and program structuring;
 - providing leadership for professional K-12 or extra-institutional higher-education practitioners in areas such as more effective and life-affirming pedagogical methodologies, instructional techniques and program structuring.

Defining Scholarship by Audience:

The education department views not only purpose but also audience as integral to understanding its scholarship. As such, the department recognizes three sorts of audiences that shape scholarship in education: personal, applied, and advanced. These also align with those audiences outlined in The Expanded Mission Statement of Calvin College. The education department believes it is crucial for each of its members to be engaged in personal scholarship (as outlined below). The department also recognizes that a personal engagement of new ideas, although good personal scholarship, is not by itself applied or advanced scholarship when it remains a private activity of a faculty member. The conditions for being applied or advanced scholarship are: (i) when it is opened to a public audience for dissemination and evaluation, either in the form of writing or oral presentation, and (ii) when it meets the standard of reflective work that goes beyond merely stating of things already generally accepted in the field. The three audiences that define scholarship in the education department are as follows:

- Personal scholarship is geared to the professional integrity and improvement of oneself. This means staying current in the field of education and remaining inquisitive about the world.
 - Personal scholarship in education includes activities such as:
 - keeping up with important educational books and journals in one's field or sub-field;
 - attending seminars, conferences, conventions important for education;
 - planning, practicing, and examining various pedagogies relating directly to the subject being taught.
- Applied scholarship is intellectual reflection geared to audiences beyond the immediate college or academic field of education, with the understanding that this is informed by one's professional reading, research and reflection. The term "applied" is misleading in the area of education if it is taken to suggest that pure theory is the locus of new ideas and that application is merely bringing those new ideas to bear on particular areas. Since especially in the field of education theory and practice interact and inform each other, new intellectual understandings arise out of the very act of application, be that in the classroom, in the development of new programs, or in working with K-12 teachers. Thus the results of applied scholarship are also new ideas, ones that might not have been developed in any other way. Applied scholarship in education includes activities such as:
 - writing popular educational articles and books
 - consulting, advising, counseling on educational matters to schools, both public and Christian;
 - leading intra-institutional seminars;
 - speaking on topics of extra-collegiate or academic interest;
 - speaking at conferences of professional K-12 teacher organizations at the local, regional, national and international levels;
 - developing innovative and effective K-12 curriculum materials such as textbooks; developing innovative and effective new departmental programs.
- Advanced scholarship is the generation, interpretation and evaluation of new knowledge (theories, practices) for and before one's professional and academic peers. The term "advanced" is misleading if it is taken to suggest the exclusive domain of new knowledge in contrast to applied scholarship, for in the field of education theory and practice interact. Advanced scholarship in education includes activities such as:
 - undertaking and reporting on empirical research;
 - writing academic articles and books;
 - presenting papers at academic conferences.

2. Expectations of colleagues

"Benchmarks" (One of the great challenges in writing the departmental statements is in trying to avoid locking ourselves into hard numbers and yet providing enough concreteness that new colleagues are not left bewildered by generality. Here the English Department uses the "scenarios" approach that other departments

have found helpful, but it also breaks the scenarios into each of the four typical reappointment and promotion processes.)

Because “scholarship” means not only publication but also a continuous and evolving sense of engagement, assessing scholarship involves much more than counting publications and gauging the prestige of their venues. It means assessing the academic maturity, acumen, and skill of a colleague. Needless to say, that can be done only imperfectly and therefore requires humility, charity, and encouragement.

The risk of providing specific guidelines for a minimally acceptable scholarly record at various career stages lies in creating a “false economy.” This false economy may suggest that we value traditional forms of scholarship more highly than a range of forms. This false economy may also give the impression that the life of an engaged scholar amounts to CV building or following a recipe. Finally, this false economy argues that production counts, not exploration or process.

Admittedly, benchmarks and guidelines are fraught with simplification and reduction. Nevertheless such guidelines remain necessary, and herein lies an irresolvable tension. To avoid guidelines in favor of an open-ended description creates problems of its own. A non-specific document may make it difficult for new hires to understand scholarly expectations. A non-specific document may also leave a candidate for reappointment or tenure vulnerable to the vagaries that occur when all-too fallible colleagues attempt to assess the quality of a scholarly record. Finally, a non-specific document may leave expectations for scholarship so murky that no one can relax enough to accomplish her best work and sustain engagement.

We simply cannot resolve the tension between crafting a helpful document and crafting a reductive one. Still, the benefits of benchmarks outweigh potential risks. A tough and demanding Gordian knot lies at the center of this question, and the only sure response is that either route demands much humility, charity, and hard work on the part of all. What is non-negotiable are mutual encouragement and support and honesty of assessment.

While any assessment of a colleague’s scholarly production must take into account its quality, there must be a level of seriousness and rigor in the colleague’s work, shown at any level of audience, that is affirmed by the colleague’s scholarly peers. In addition, the quantity of scholarly production matters. Thus, assessment must be based on whether the colleague’s work participates in the conversations of the field, on whether colleagues and peers esteem the matter and form of those contributions, and on whether the colleague has shown the sustained record of productivity the department expects.

With these goals in mind, the department sets these minimal standards to guide colleagues toward intellectual and academic maturity, recognizing always that departmental assessment must embrace reasonable latitude in its application of these benchmarks.

First Reappointment

By the time of the first reappointment, a period of two years, the new colleague should show an active and eager engagement with the scholarly life by accomplishing the following:

- Development of a five-year scholarly plan
- Participation in a good working relationship with scholarly mentor(s)
- Production of a portfolio of materials that might be represented by one of the following lines:
 - Two peer-reviewed scholarly articles
 - Two conference papers and a scholarly article or a substantial review essay
 - A conference paper and a book chapter in an edited collection
 - A conference paper or scholarly article, and the beginning of a monograph
 - A gathering of poems
 - Three personal essays, feature articles, review essays, works of creative non-fiction—perhaps leading toward a collection
 - A scholarly article and two book reviews
 - Two short stories
 - Scholarly editorial work that shows original conception, assessment, and critique—including written commentary

Note: written materials shall be at least accepted for publication.

Second Reappointment

The department looks for a continued strong public presence through discriminating choices about venues as well as affirmative peer review of the colleague’s writing. It looks for regular and sustained production that may suggest a trajectory, as well as a growing sense of a Reformed vision of purpose. The full portfolio (which includes the materials from the previous reappointment) might look like the following in terms of its quantity:

- One additional scholarly article
- Two additional conference papers and a review essay
- Prospectus for and significant portions of a monograph that has had some public presence
- A gathering of poems and other creative work, heading toward a full-length manuscript
- Two additional short stories or a movement toward a book-length work of fiction

Scholarly editorial work that shows original conception, assessment, and critique—including written commentary

Third Reappointment, with Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure

The third reappointment comes with tenure, a critical juncture in the academic career. The candidate for tenure must demonstrate continued relish, participation, and success in the scholarly life, and the candidate must also distill her thinking on the relation of scholarship in her discipline to the Reformed tradition. Once again, only two years separate the second and third reappointment. With that in mind, the department expects to see a portfolio of the following possibilities:

- An additional substantive scholarly article
- Two additional conference papers and a review essay
- The acceptance of a monograph
- An edited text with scholarly apparatus and introduction
- A full-length manuscript of poetry or other creative work
- Scholarly editorial work that shows original conception, assessment, and critique—including written commentary

Promotion to Full Professor

The candidate for full professor should demonstrate the kind of scholarly life that will mark his career at Calvin College long after all promotion and tenure considerations. He should show evidence not only of continued scholarly production, but of growing scholarly accomplishment and achievement that is evidenced by his public presence in the academy.

This set of benchmarks is exemplified in the following, all of which are expected for promotion to full professor:

- Ongoing productivity in publication and contribution toward the shaping of disciplinary conversation through one's writing and editing
- Scholarship marked not only by publication, but by such opportunities as the following:
 - Panel participation
 - Conference organization and participation
 - Guest teaching and lecturing
 - The mentoring of younger scholars
 - Cultivation or proposing of special issues in academic journals

Again, the illustrations of the benchmarks are intended to suggest various routes by which departmental expectations at various levels of a colleague's career might be met. The benchmarks are to be applied with charity and humility on the part of all assessors, and seen as challenges and encouragements by those moving through the steps.

“Expectations of the Faculty in Research and Scholarship in the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry” (Too often departmental statements try to create the appearance of being open-ended when in fact the department has quite specific scholarly expectations. This part of the statement from Chemistry and Biochemistry Department combines an explanation of the types of evidence that faculty members should provide along with concrete expectations for productivity.)

Although faculty are expected to be active and productive scholars throughout their careers, there are important points of evaluation: initial appointment, reappointment, reappointment with tenure and post-tenure review. Faculty making satisfactory progress towards tenure will normally provide the department and Dean with the following as written evidence of their research and scholarship activity.

- I. Research plans at the time of their initial appointment.
- II. At least one proposal in which the faculty member is primary author that was submitted to an external agency for funding at the time of their first reappointment, which normally occurs during their third year at Calvin. Funding could be requested for the support of advanced scholarship, the acquisition of major equipment, or curriculum innovation. Faculty are further strongly encouraged to work towards the goal of successfully obtaining funding for at least one of their proposals by the time of tenure consideration.
- III. At least two papers in a peer-reviewed journal or book chapter(s) by the time of the tenure decision. These publications should result from work done since the initial appointment at Calvin, but not from work on a Ph.D. dissertation or postdoctoral project. Ideally, Calvin undergraduate students* would be coauthors on these publications.

The department doesn't rule out a faculty member doing collaborative work off-campus, but since it sees research as an important part of the training of its students, the department strongly encourages faculty research to involve Calvin students wherever it is done.

“Appendix” (The French Department’s concise scenarios-based approach has the added virtue of a section on expectations for promotion to full professor. Since Calvin’s process for promotion to full professor is relatively recent, the explanation is helpful to new and recently tenured faculty.)

i. Reappointment with Tenure

Here are four examples of persons who, hired as recent Ph.D.s, would satisfy the department’s expectations in scholarship at the time of reappointment with tenure.

Professor A has had two scholarly articles published in refereed journals and has another article under submission with a respected journal in the discipline. She has presented three papers at professional conferences, and has seen one of those papers appear in the proceedings of the conference. She is also the author of two book reviews.

Professor B has had an article published in a leading journal on second language acquisition, as well as a series of four essays on language learning published in a semi-popular Christian publication. This professor has led two week-long workshops for faculty at the college and has presented two or three workshops at a regional professional language association. At present he is working on developing a software component for a first-year text scheduled for publication in the next two years by a major textbook publisher. He has authored a book review for one of the major professional journals in his field.

Professor C has published a number of book reviews and has been revising some articles for submission to a peer-reviewed journal. Her research was put on hold because of maternity-leaves and then child-care difficulties (or difficulties related to care of a relative or spouse) while maintaining a full-time teaching, advising, and committee load. One article, however, has been received for publication by a journal and the work in progress shows similar promise, as does her research plan.

Professor D has seen a re-worked version of his dissertation published by a prominent scholarly press, and currently has two additional articles under submission in peer-reviewed journals. He has presented two papers at scholarly conferences, and has been asked by colleagues in his field to write a chapter for a forthcoming book.

ii. Promotion to Professor

As noted in section IV, it is expected that a faculty member will prepare a current research and scholarship plan and self-evaluation at the time of post-tenure review and promotion to the rank of Professor. The French Department expects its tenured faculty to continue an active engagement in scholarly work even if proportional contributions in the four areas of teaching, scholarship, advising and community service may change over the years. For example, a faculty member who has had some especially productive scholarly years and participated less in community service during that time may produce less scholarly work in later years but be more involved in community service, and vice versa. A faculty member who has abandoned an active scholarly agenda (or whose teaching has become substandard) will not be recommended for promotion. On the other hand, a faculty member who demonstrates active involvement in scholarship with plans for new scholarly projects and who continues to show positive contributions in the areas of teaching, advising and community service will be recommended for promotion.

“Appendix: What are some hypothetical models of achievement in research and scholarship?” (Here the Physics Department use clear and direct prose to set up its scenarios-based [“hypothetical models”] explanation of expectations.)

While the Physics and Astronomy Department is not sympathetic to woodenly-applied productivity guidelines or quotas, we do have some idea about what sort of goals members of the department, whether tenure-track or post-tenure, ought to entertain as they plan for the use of their time. In the hypothetical ‘case studies’ below, we indicate imaginable tracks that represent possible contributions in research and scholarship.

In each case we expect an ongoing and sustained effort. Specific accomplishments mentioned are intended as likely indicators of appropriate efforts, not as a checklist.

We emphasize that these 4 case studies are examples only, and not meant to be prescriptive.

1. Person 1 has pursued a research program (as narrowly defined above). She has vigorously pursued funding from external agencies, given formal seminar and conference presentations about her project, worked on the project in summers and as possible during the school year, involved students in the project in meaningful ways, and published some significant results or implications of the project in refereed journals within the disciplines of physics or astronomy.

2. Person 2 has pursued an interdisciplinary program of scholarship. He has submitted research or publication proposals, given internal and external seminar presentations on the progress of the work, and published some results via conference proceedings, a chapter in book, or some other formally published form.
3. Person 3 has pursued the track of curricular improvement. He has submitted a grant proposal to an external funding agency, developed innovations in curriculum or instrumentation, described these innovations in internal seminar and external conference presentations as well as in formal publications in refereed journals of science education.
4. Person 4 had been pursuing one of the three tracks above, but is particularly gifted in communicating the nature of science and a knowledge of physics to the public, and so has changed her focus. She has participated in a major program for disseminating science to the general public. This programmatic effort has been supported by external funding, guided by definite goals and objectives, and involved collaborations with other scientists and institutions. This person has addressed conferences, described the project, and has written reports and articles assessing the import of the program.

3. Evaluation of scholarship

“Methods of Evaluation” (The issue of peer review is very tricky for scholarship that is not destined for peer-reviewed publication. Theater and film are good examples. The CAS Department offers a useful model for addressing non-traditional academic peer review.)

The range of academic fields in our department requires a variety of methods of evaluation. Nevertheless, scholarship must be subjected to outside evaluation by experts in the field. In the case of published research, this is easily obtained. For example, the peer-review process for journal articles provides by its nature an evaluation of quality. The value and importance of a particular book can be determined by the prestige of the publisher, prepublication comments of peer reviewers and post-publication reviews in scholarly journals. We may secure the evaluation of outside experts on a colleague’s scholarly area. We encourage and admire publications that reach a broader popular audience as well, and view them as fully acceptable ways of demonstrating one’s research and scholarly activity.

Even though the evaluation of creative work is less well-developed than for traditional scholarship, it must be *reviewed* and *evaluated* to count as scholarship. Such work can be gauged in a number of ways including reviews, professional association evaluations, letters of evaluation from qualified individuals, peer reviews and, in certain circumstances, evaluations by qualified tenured members of the CAS Department. Meaningful reviews of creative products can appear in scholarly and professional publications, and in some cases in newspapers or popular magazines. Some professional associations regularly provide written evaluations of works selected for showing at their conventions. Letters evaluating a faculty member’s work can be requested from knowledgeable individuals at institutions where the work has been shown. As is the case with scholarly reviews, such letters should be from persons with an expertise in the kind of creative production in question, and the worth of the evaluation depends to some extent on the reputation of the evaluator.

It should be noted that there are certain types of creative work for which appropriate means of dissemination and evaluation have not been devised (e.g., website design). In such cases, when it is necessary to rely on peer evaluations to establish the value and importance of faculty creative work it is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide a means for peer validation and to describe and document how the communication and evaluation were accomplished.

The department chair has administrative responsibility for encouraging the department’s members to meet its standards (and informing them if they are remiss). This occurs primarily during discussions about reappointments and tenure. The department chair makes clear to those in tenure-track appointments that a positive tenure decision depends partly on the quality of the faculty member’s scholarly activity. Tenured members of the department must view and evaluate creative work that is being presented as scholarship, just as they are expected to examine the traditional scholarship of non-tenured faculty. In addition, a panel of external evaluators should be established to evaluate creative work and to determine its worth as scholarship. Non-tenured faculty will submit to the department chair and Personnel Committee a scholarly plan that will indicate the kinds of scholarship to be pursued. This plan and the non-tenured faculty member’s progress will be evaluated annually by the tenured faculty.

“The Importance of Quality” (In this paragraph the Philosophy Department tackles the thorny issue of assessing and giving credit for quality of scholarship.)

What we shall try to provide is a list of activities in philosophy that we regard as significant indicators of scholarly development. The list will be such that, other things being equal, some items on the list will generally be weightier than others. However, other things are not always equal. In general, for example, publications are regarded as more significant than oral presentations. However, an important oral address might outweigh a number of relatively insignificant publications. Everything depends on the quality of the address and the important of the occasion as

compared with the quality of the publications and the importance of the outlet. The list therefore cannot be algorithmically applied; judgments of quality and significance are always of the utmost importance and such judgments cannot be derived from a list in a mechanical fashion.

“What methods should be used to evaluate the research and scholarship of the social work faculty?” (The Social Work statement includes this thorough summary of methods for evaluating scholarship.)

The following methods will be employed:

- *Class Visits* In accordance with the Faculty Handbook’s procedures, program faculty requested by the Director of Social Work will visit the candidate’s classes and submit written evaluations of the candidate’s scholarship in this setting.
- *Student and Alumni Evaluations* Consistent again with the procedures stated in the Faculty Handbook, current majors, non major, and alumni will be requested by the director to submit evaluations of the candidate’s scholarship in this setting.
- *Seminars at the Time of Reappointment, Tenure, and Tenure Review* Faculty up for reappointment will conduct a seminar describing how they critically engage the ideas, perspectives, practices, and paradigms included in the generalist model of practice. In addition, they will describe how a Reformed Christian outlook is incorporated into this scholarship. Those faculty who have no other written scholarship or research to submit to their colleagues will be expected to write a formal paper which describes their scholarship.
- *Faculty Peer Review* Peers, appointed by the Director of Social Work, will review any writings of the candidate for reappointment. These writings may include published books, articles for refereed journals, book reviews, written proposals for research (funded and not funded), monographs, and written materials for workshops for professionals in the field. The written evaluations of peers will be incorporated into their own and the Director’s recommendations regarding reappointment of the faculty person.
- *Review of Writings by Director of Social Work* The Director will similarly review the writings of the candidate.
- *Professional Plans* Within four months of the first appointment to the social work faculty and at each reappointment, faculty members will submit a written plan of scholarly activities and research (if applicable) to the director. The plan will specify expected outcomes. The plan will be reviewed in a Social Work Program Committee meeting and either be approved or returned to the faculty member for revision based on the committee’s discussion. At the time of reappointment, the director and candidate will review progress made. The director will include as assessment of progress made in the recommendation made to the Dean and PSC regarding reappointment.
- *Outside Evaluation* At the time of reappointment, the director will consult with the candidate about the latter’s wish to have or not have an outside peer evaluate the professional and scholarly activity of the candidate. The director will provide a copy of the criteria for reappointment from the Faculty Handbook to the outside evaluator.

4. Student research

“Appendix I. Undergraduate Research” (Given Calvin’s increasing emphasis on student research, the Mathematics Department supplies a key piece for scholarship statements—especially for departments that expect faculty-student research. The guideline to be inferred: If a department expects colleagues to engage in a certain kind of scholarship, talk about those expectations in the scholarship statement.)

One specific example of an activity that crosses the boundaries between teaching and scholarship is the supervision of student research projects. There is growing interest in student research in mathematics. Student research can be a very good experience for both the student researcher and the faculty mentor and is therefore strongly encouraged. At the same time it must be recognized that most mathematics research projects do not lend themselves well to direct student involvement, so most department members will face a choice between pursuing their own research or supervising student research. The department needs some faculty members to be involved in student research, but does not require this of everyone.

Student-centered research will usually result in different kinds of products than result from other types of research. In particular, most undergraduate research projects will not result in a publication in a refereed research journal (although some will). Despite that, it is still essential that there be products that result from the research since an important part of the research experience is that of sharing the results with a community of interested scholars. Thus both the student and the supervisor should give talks on the results of the research. The Michigan Undergraduate Mathematics Conference is an appropriate venue for student talks and the Annual Meeting of the Michigan Section of

the Mathematical Association of America is an appropriate venue for faculty talks on student research. In addition, there should be some kind of publication. This could be a paper coauthored by student and supervisor that is published in an established research journal or it could be a student-authored paper that appears in an undergraduate journal (such as the Rose-Hulman *Undergraduate Math Journal*).

5. Departmental support for scholarship

“How will the department promote research and scholarship?” (The following list of supports from the Sociology statement reminds us of the need for new faculty to know what support they can expect. The list also reminds those in a department of the support they are accountable to provide.)

The culture of the department is crucial for the stimulation and encouragement of research. Individual members will be encouraged to pursue their own research when they regularly see other members engaged in research activities. When research is part of the normal affairs of a department then every member is much more likely to conduct his/her own research. One part of this research culture will be informal inquiry into the progress of ongoing research of other members of the department; another part will be individuals informally urging others to pursue particular research opportunities.

Listed below are several ways department faculty can facilitate research and scholarship. The suitability of each of these ways may depend upon whether one is referring to personal, applied, or advanced scholarship.

- Departmental Resources: The Sociology Department’s Deur Endowment fund makes possible the disbursement of \$30,000 per fiscal year for the support of departmental activities and faculty development.
- Faculty Development Seminars: At monthly seminars, faculty members can discuss and present new developments in their specific interest areas, current advanced scholarship endeavors, and/or teaching issues pertaining to content and methodology. Additionally, the department can consider such things as a ‘seven year plan’ for encouraging a more specific rotational distribution of sabbaticals that continually stimulates department members to think about future plans, finding ways to stimulate collaborative research and scholarship efforts within the department, and encouraging faculty to find ways to utilize student assistants in their research and scholarship.
- Dialogue and Encouragement from Colleagues: When faculty members submit scholarship plans and conduct seminars on their research and scholarship, other faculty members will engage in a respectful and hospitable discussion. At these times and under less formal circumstances, the faculty person will be encouraged and supported in their efforts.
- Dean for Research and Scholarship: Several resources for research and scholarship are available through the Office of the Dean for Scholarship and Research. Resources include mentoring by “expert” colleagues in other disciplines, opportunities for summer seminar participation, Calvin Research Fellowships (academic year and summer), and funds for presenting at national conferences when departmental resources are exhausted (faculty must meet fairly stringent criteria to apply).
- Center for Social Research: The CSR is positioning itself to mentor faculty in research and has limited funds available for start-up projects.
- Calvin Center for Christian Scholarship: Reading groups that foster interdisciplinary scholarly and research conversations, as well as larger projects, are possibilities that can be explored with the CCCS.

“Matrix 2, Individuals Who Can Help” (In this visually accessible chart, the Biology Department identifies for its new faculty the people who are responsible to help them with developing their scholarship.)

Matrix 2 – Individuals Who can Help with Progress and the Feedback that Each Could Provide

Colleague	Area of Endeavor			
	Teaching	Scholarship	Advising	Service
Department Chair				
Personnel Committee	Feedback: types of interaction that a faculty member should be fostering; activities and alliances that would define a tenure trajectory and help to ensure steady progress to that goal.			
Mentor				
Candidate				