

C. Guidelines for the Evaluation of Scholarship

General principles for determining merit in scholarship

1. *Variety within the discipline of English Studies.* In determining merit, units of the Department (at present the Chair for salary, the RPT committee for promotion and tenure) should evaluate scholarship in the context of a department which accepts the viability of many different scholarly activities within the general discipline. Thus (for example) critical works will not *per se* be privileged over creative writing, bibliographical, editorial, electronic, or rhetorical studies.
 - 1.1. *Acceptable fields of scholarship and professional achievement.* As of the time of writing these guidelines, scholarly activities currently or recently associated with the Department may be listed as the following (sorted alphabetically).
 - Anthologies
 - Bibliographical studies
 - Conference papers
 - Creative writing
 - Editions
 - Editorial contributions to journals etc.
 - Historical research (related to the discipline)
 - Literary criticism
 - Professional writing (including journalism)
 - Reviewing/reading materials for journals, SSHRCC, presses etc.
 - Software development (related to the discipline)
 - Studies in pedagogy (related to the discipline)

In considering salary recommendations, the chair should consider the following points:

- a. Some members of the Department are engaging in interdisciplinary studies. These should be considered on the same basis as those listed above, so long as one of the disciplines is normally considered part of the discipline.
 - b. While some members of the Department have been hired in the expectation that they will work in one particular sub-discipline, they cannot be required to work only in that area (thus any member of the Department is entitled to change horses anywhere in the river).
 - c. The above list is not graven in stone. The world is changing.
 - d. Not all forms of professional achievement result in publication.
2. *Value added.* Work within the department's various disciplines will be evaluated according to a general principle of value added, both in the nature of the work and its evaluation by peers.
 - 2.1. *The nature of the work within a given discipline.* An example is the comparison between an edition that consists of a facsimile with an introduction and a fully edited edition with footnotes and critical apparatus; similar judgment is needed in all disciplines. What is implied here is the need to undertake some relative judgment of scholarship by a measure other than pages/words/rods/poles/perches. Arguably, a 20 page article on a challenging topic may add more value to its field than a book on a more conventional subject. For work in new media and digital humanities, the department relies on the recommendations of the *MLA Guidelines for Evaluating Computer-Related Work* and the *MLA Statement on Publication in Electronic Journals*, via www.mla.org/resources/documents/rep_it. Especially important to keep in mind among the recommendations in the *MLA Guidelines* is the role of the faculty member in ensuring that the work they plan to undertake is recognisable, creditable, and documentable within departmental evaluative structures (see the subsection "Guidelines for Candidates and Faculty Members").
 - 2.2. *Peer evaluation.* In traditional print, the publication by a major press, and refereed publication in a major journal have always added value. In newer media, the faculty member will be required to provide equivalent evidence of peer review; see the *MLA Guidelines for Evaluating Computer-Related Work*, as well as the *MLA Statement on Publication in Electronic Journals*, and the *Guidelines for Institutional*

Support of and Access to IT for Faculty and Students. In all such cases where a case is put for newer media, the Department will keep on file the documentation, and make a summary available for consultation by all members of the Department. Members of the department working in newer areas of scholarly studies will similarly need to compile evidence of peer review.

- 2.3. *The forum of publication or recognition.* The Department has always recognized that some presses and journals represent a higher accolade than others in terms of peer review. A different example might be in journalism, where the *National Enquirer* might be legitimately considered a less impressive forum than the *New Yorker*. It should be noted that, especially in more experimental areas, it is likely that peer evaluation will be of a less formal nature than is common in established disciplines. Members publishing in newer outlets should provide evidence of quality.
3. In the determination of merit for salary purposes, scholarly publication is considered either at the time of documented final acceptance or at the time of actual publication, according to the choice of the faculty member. Members of the department will not normally be credited for work in progress.
4. Consistency of application. One of the problems faced by members of the Department who work in what have been considered marginal or newer areas is that there has been no mechanism for developing a kind of "case history" of previous decisions; thus each new Chair or RPT committee must be convinced anew of the value of the research. Especially in those areas that are new to the Department, it is important that the chair develop a file that preserves the rationales of previous decisions; see point 2.2 above.

D. Guidelines for the Evaluation of Other Contributions

The Salary Policy provides two ways of recognizing other contributions: (1) through the normal route of recommendations at the level of RI1 and RI2 (2) through a special fund held by the Vice-President Academic, as specified in section 1.4.4.a. Under this procedure, the Vice-President Academic may award a number of RI1s, "not greater than 3% of the total number of faculty members," for "substantial contributions to the functioning of the University in areas other than teaching, scholarship, and professional achievement."

Section 10.3 of the Tenure Document defines other contributions as follows: extra university recognition; contributions to the development of faculty, school, etc.; contributions to student life; contributions to university administrative assignments; and contributions to the community, province, or nation in scholarly capacities.

The Department's current practice includes the following specific activities under other contributions: committee assignments (Department and University); lectures to non-professional groups; participation as actor, musician, etc.; broadcasts; conference organization; poetry readings, etc.

In reviewing faculty for other contributions, the chair should take into account all of the activities mentioned above. The chair should also ensure that whenever possible other contributions are judged for quality as well as for quantity. Faculty members should provide explanations and evidence regarding activities listed as other contributions.

2. Senior Instructors

The Department regards the position of Senior Instructor as renewable, subject to the demonstration of continued teaching effectiveness and professional competence.

2.1 Appointments

The following criteria are the basis for appointments made at the rank of Senior Instructor:

- Teaching effectiveness as measured by a) student teaching evaluations and b) peer evaluations by the Director of the Writing Program and the Director of the Literature Program.
- Length of service to the Department.
- Specialized expertise related to specific Department needs.
- Other contributions, especially those related to teaching effectiveness.

2.2 Teaching

Senior Instructors will not normally teach courses numbered 300 or above. However, when the Department has a particular need of expertise in an area not otherwise covered, they may be asked to teach senior courses, so long as they meet the following criteria:

- a) a Ph.D. or equivalent in publication, or professional activity in the field; and
- b) evidence of a continuing awareness of scholarly activity in the field.

1.2.3 Supervision of students

Senior Instructors are eligible to supervise undergraduate Directed Readings and Graduating Essays if they have demonstrated an active research interest, or have taught senior courses, in the field of supervision and have the consent of both the Chair and the Director of Honours. [7 April 1993]

2.4 Merit Points

Senior instructors are eligible for course load reduction under the merit point system.

[7 April 1993; 14 September, 1993]

2.5 Criteria for Reappointment and Salary Awards

According to the Tenure Document (Sec. 10(b)) “All evaluations of a Senior Instructor for reappointment and salary shall be based on Teaching Effectiveness (see 10.1) and Other Contributions (see 10.3) of which Teaching Effectiveness is of paramount importance.” According to Sec. 10.1 “evaluation of teaching ability shall be based upon as many kinds of evidence as possible.”

It is essential, therefore, that each Senior Instructor establish a Teaching Portfolio which should contain:

- (a) Recent peer evaluations covering a variety of courses.
- (b) Student questionnaires, administered and reported according to the procedures laid down by the Department (see B.2.2) - each year in the case of a two-year appointment; at least every second year in the case of a four-year appointment.
- (c) A full set of course outlines for each year.
- (d) A representative sampling of assignments, essay topics, hand outs, etc.
- (e) Other items such as self-evaluations, and a statement of teaching philosophy, evidence of attendance at workshops, seminars, or any other means by which the instructor has sought to improve her/his teaching.
- (f) Evidence of other activities designed to “maintain an awareness of current developments in their own fields” (Guidelines on the Position of Senior Instructor). Publications will be considered in so far as they relate to Teaching Effectiveness.

Other Contributions, according to the Tenure Document can include such items as

- a) Attainment of extra-university recognition which reflects to advantage on the University of Victoria.
- b) Contributions to the development of the faculty member’s Department, Faculty, or School.
- c) Contributions to student life.

- d) Contributions on University committee assignments.
- e) Contributions on University administrative assignments.
- f) Contributions to the community, province, or nation in scholarly capacities.