

Department of German and Russian Studies

Guidelines and Standards for the Research and Professional Development Portion of Third-Year Review, Tenure and Promotion, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Evaluations

In the spirit of the teacher-scholar paradigm embraced by the College of Charleston, faculty in the Department are expected to make intellectual contributions to their areas of research primarily through published scholarship of high quality and distinction. Such contributions should continue throughout each faculty member's career, giving evidence of steady growth in the respective scholarly and professional discipline and, over time, should result in a sustained, career-long record of published scholarship.

While, as stated in the *Faculty/Administration Manual (FAM)*, the guiding principle for the evaluation of each work of scholarship is always the “overall **quality** and **substance** of a candidate's research and publication record” (*FAM*), the following departmental criteria and standards must be **met**, but not exceeded in order for a faculty member to be considered for promotion to Senior Instructor, for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, for promotion to Professor, and for a “superior” rating in post-tenure reviews. These criteria and standards pertain only to the research and professional development portion of the tenure or promotion evaluation process and **exceed** those indicated in the appropriate sections of the latest *FAM*.

STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION TO SENIOR INSTRUCTOR¹

Possession of at least a Master's degree in a field of the teaching appointment. According to the *FAM*, instructors are expected to conduct research. Specifically, the *FAM* specifies as a professional development standard for instructors that “professional development involves [...] research in pedagogy” (Section IV, K, 2, a). While printed dissemination of research is neither a college nor a departmental requirement in the evaluation of instructors, oral dissemination is expected. The *FAM* specifically lists as evidence for instructors the “conducting of professional workshops and seminars” (Section IV, K, 2, b, 4, d). In addition, the Department recognizes presentations at professional conferences as such evidence. At least two (2) such presentations are required.

¹ Promotion to Senior Instructor requires that the teaching effectiveness of the candidate be designated “exemplary” by the *Departmental Tenure and Promotion Panel* (henceforth *T&P Panel*) in accordance with the requirements of the *Faculty/Administration Manual*.

STANDARDS FOR THIRD-YEAR REVIEW OF A TENURE-TRACK APPOINTMENT

Possession of a doctorate in a field of German or Russian Studies. Typically the Third-Year Review dossier for a candidate on tenure track is due in the middle of the fifth semester after the initial appointment (e.g., generally in the fall semester of the third year). This leaves only four semesters (and fewer semesters still if a candidate opts for a shortened probationary period) to set up a productive research agenda and to harvest first scholarly results as preliminary evidence that an evaluatee is indeed making sufficient progress toward meeting the departmental expectations and standards for tenure.

While a new faculty member is strongly encouraged to give conference presentations, this in and of itself is not sufficient to receive a recommendation for retention. At the very minimum, a candidate is required to provide evidence that at least one (1) scholarly or professional manuscript of publishable quality—based on work conducted at the College beyond the doctoral dissertation (see footnote 8)—has been submitted and has undergone either “refereed” or “reviewed” appraisal (positive or negative) by the editor and/or the editorial board.

STANDARDS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Possession of a doctorate in a field of German or Russian Studies. Three (3) works of scholarship are required while at the rank of Assistant Professor. All works must indicate the author’s College of Charleston affiliation. The research for at least two (2) of these works must have been conducted while at the College of Charleston. At least one (1) work must be from category A-4 of *Scholarship Equivalencies* listed below (e.g., a refereed publication by a highly regarded scholarly venue of national or European stature). A maximum of one (1) translation publication (see footnote 5) or one (1) substantial work of creative writing² will be credited.

STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR³

Possession of a doctorate in a field of German or Russian Studies. Four (4) works of scholarship are required since promotion to Associate Professor. At least two (2) works must be from category A-4 (or a combination of A-1 and A-4) of *Scholarship Equivalencies* listed below (e.g., a refereed publication by a highly regarded scholarly venue of national or European stature). Further, there should be clear evidence of an active research agenda beyond the promotion. In the case of a faculty member hired at the Associate Professor rank, all works of scholarship must have been conducted at the College of Charleston, and all works must indicate

² A *substantial* published work of creative writing (e.g., a drama, novel, collection of poetry or short stories) is a work of scholarship that is deemed appropriate in the field of German or Russian Studies.

³ Besides the meeting of the departmental research and professional development standards, eligibility for promotion to Full Professor requires that the teaching effectiveness of the candidate be designated “exemplary” by the *T&P Panel*.

the author's College of Charleston affiliation. A maximum of one (1) translation publication (see footnote 5) or one (1) substantial work of creative writing (see footnote 2) will be credited.

STANDARDS FOR A "SUPERIOR" RATING IN THE POST-TENURE REVIEW⁴

Possession of a doctorate in a field of German or Russian Studies. Four (4) works of scholarship are required since promotion to Professor. At least two (2) works must be from category A-4 (or a combination of A-1 and A-4) of *Scholarship Equivalencies* listed below (e.g., a refereed publication by a highly regarded scholarly venue of national or European stature). Further, there should be clear evidence of an active research agenda beyond the post-tenure review. In the case of a faculty member hired at the Full Professor rank, all works of scholarship must have been conducted at the College of Charleston, and all works must indicate the author's College of Charleston affiliation. A maximum of one (1) translation publication (see footnote 5) or one (1) substantial work of creative writing (see footnote 2) will be credited.

DEFINITION OF WORKS OF SCHOLARSHIP

Any original scholarship or translation⁵ in subjects and areas relevant to the field of German(ic) Studies or the field of Russian Studies, or the pedagogy of these two fields, which results in the public distribution of a publication may be considered a work of scholarship, provided that the author's College of Charleston affiliation is indicated in the publication and the publication resulted primarily from work accomplished at the College of Charleston. A letter of unconditional acceptance from the editor or the editorial board is evidence for successful completion of the work of scholarship that is pending publication.⁶

The *FAM* explicitly requires publications to be "peer-refereed" or "otherwise juried." (*FAM*, Section IV, J, 4, a, 2).⁷ For the purposes of the departmental review the following terms will be used to describe acceptable juried or peer-reviewed publications:

⁴ Besides the meeting of the departmental research and professional development standards, eligibility for a "superior" rating in the post-tenure review requires that the teaching effectiveness of the candidate be designated "exemplary" by the departmental *T&P Panel* in accordance with the requirements of the *Faculty/Administration Manual*.

⁵ The translation of a *substantial* literary work (e.g., a *substantial* work of primary literature, such as a drama, novel, collection of poetry or short stories) is a work of scholarship that is deemed appropriate, provided it lies in the candidate's area of academic training and in the field of the candidate's teaching appointment.

⁶ A journalistic work is not considered a work of scholarship.

⁷ Further, see the memorandum by the Provost entitled *Tenure and Promotion Guidelines*, particularly section C, entitled *Research and Professional Development*.

»REFEREED PUBLICATIONS«

Theoretical, expository, pedagogical, linguistic, or translation publications that are accepted for publication, either in print or online, only after the editor has submitted the manuscripts for outside peer review, and after all the external reviewers' concerns, which are generally forwarded to the author, have been addressed to the satisfaction of the editor.

»REVIEWED PUBLICATIONS«

Theoretical, expository, pedagogical, linguistic, or translation publications that are accepted for publication, either in print or online, after having undergone an in-house, "editorial" review process by the editor(s) or by the publisher's in-house reviewers.

»OTHER WORKS OF SCHOLARSHIP«

The Department recognizes that a wide variety of media may be used to disseminate and report scholarship results. Furthermore, it recognizes a wide range of effort levels on the part of the investigator to finalize scholarly projects. As a result, the following list of *Scholarship Equivalencies* has been established to evaluate the relative meritorious weights of works of scholarship. These equivalencies are based both on the type and prestige of the publication venue and on the amount of effort required on the part of the scholar to complete a project and to see it through the publication process.

SCHOLARSHIP EQUIVALENCIES**Category A: Refereed Works of Scholarship**

1. Sole authorship of a published scholarly book which has been independently **refereed** through the publisher's editorial board and/or external reviewers is considered as three (3) works.⁸

⁸ Publication of a doctoral dissertation is not generally seen as the production of a new work of scholarship. The dissertation is part of the doctoral program, and in effect is recognized and rewarded by the granting of the doctorate. The doctorate is the basic requirement for a tenure-track position. While the publication of the dissertation is a recognition of the quality and merit of the research, it does not carry the same weight as a monograph researched, developed and written during the individual's career at the College of Charleston.

In preparing materials for annual evaluations or dossiers, it is the candidate's responsibility to demonstrate the extent to which the doctoral dissertation has been revised. It is appropriate not only to supply a narrative that thoroughly explains the extent of the changes and additions but also to submit the dissertation together with the published book in evidence. In the published book all altered and added sections should be highlighted.

2. Authorship of revised editions of published scholarly books (that qualify under A-1 above) are considered as one (1) work.
3. Editorship of a published scholarly book which has been independently **refereed** through the publisher's editorial board and/or external reviewers is considered as one (1) work.
4. Sole authorship of any **refereed** publication by a highly regarded national or European venue is considered as one (1) work.⁹
5. Sole authorship of a **refereed** encyclopedia or handbook entry is considered as one-half (1/2) work.

Category B: Reviewed Works of Scholarship

1. Sole authorship of any **reviewed** published scholarly article, book chapter, workbook is considered as one (1) work.
2. Editorship of any **reviewed** published scholarly book, conference proceedings volume, encyclopedia or handbook volume, etc. is considered as one (1) work.
3. Sole authorship of any **reviewed** encyclopedia or handbook entry is considered as one-half (1/2) work.
4. Sole authorship of any publication by a regional, state or local professional or scholarly organization is considered as two-thirds (2/3) work.
5. Sole authorship of any thoroughly revised and updated "re-printed" or "re-published" publication (mostly by invitation) is considered as one-half (1/2) work.
6. Sole authorship or any publication in a trade journal for the language teacher is considered as one-third (1/3) work.¹⁰
7. A written, major grant proposal submitted to a major federal, state, or private funding agency (funded or unfunded) is considered as one-half (1/2) work.

⁹ Particularly in the fields of German and Russian Studies, journals and publishing houses operating out of other continents than the North American and European continents are generally considered to be less selective and, thus, less prestigious.

¹⁰ A trade journal is a journal or magazine for the practitioner in the language teaching community.

8. A funded grant or stipend proposal submitted to a highly competitive, prestigious foundation or professional agency (Humboldt, Guggenheim, NEH, DAAD, Fulbright, Goethe Institute) is considered as one-half (1/2) work.

Category C: Other Works of Scholarship

Authorship of any of the following works of scholarship are to be considered in the evaluation process and can be awarded from one-fourth (1/4) work to one (1) work. The value must be justified and documented by the candidate.

1. Test banks, laboratory manuals, study guides, supplements to textbooks which are not self-published.
2. Published scholarly communications (such as comments, replies, letters to the editor, discussion contributions, reports, technical reports, etc.) in scholarly journals or scholarly newsletters.
3. Reviews of scholarly books published in academic or professional journals.
4. Published language teaching computer software which is not self-funded.
5. Stage productions, video productions, music productions, voice productions, web casts, pod casts, e-published Websites exclusively dedicated and relevant to scholarly areas in the fields of German and/or Russian Studies.
6. Translations of scholarly articles published in refereed or reviewed scholarly venues.
7. Funded College of Charleston faculty research grants are considered as one-fourth (1/4) work.
8. Other similar works of scholarship.

INFORMATION TO BE INCLUDED IN CANDIDATES' DOSSIERS AND IN ANNUAL EVALUATION MATERIALS

The following items pertain not only to materials submitted for annual evaluations conducted by the Chair but must also be included in each dossier the candidate submits during various stages of the retention, tenure, and promotion processes.

1. It is incumbent upon each candidate to state clearly and in writing under which of the categories listed above each publication is to be considered by the *Departmental Tenure and Promotion Panel*.

2. The candidate must specify clearly and in writing which publications resulted from original work conducted at the College of Charleston and which publication resulted from work done elsewhere.
3. For publications with multiple authors the candidate is to list all the other authors, in the order in which they appear in the publication. In addition, the candidate must provide a written explanation about the exact nature and scope of her/his own contribution and must indicate (in percentages) the contribution's weight relative to that of the co-author(s).
4. Evidence of the publication venue's review process must be submitted as part of the candidate's dossier: The masthead statement of review policy, all correspondence with the editor(s) and/or the reviewers, the journal's acceptance percentage data and any other essential information about a given publication outlet, as furnished for instance in the *MLA Directory of Periodicals* (Modern Language Association) or similar printed or online reference tools must accompany the publication off-print, photocopy, or galley proofs. It may at times be preferable for a candidate to submit work to an anthology or collection of essays on a particular topic. In this case, the process of solicitation, review and selection employed by the editor(s) must be thoroughly documented.
5. The departmental *T&P Panel* shall be the judge which journals are to be regarded highly selective and, thus, prestigious first-tier journals, or less selective second-tier and third-tier publication outlets. The *T&P Panel* shall also judge which publication venues are regarded to be of national or international stature, and it shall be so stated in the departmental letter of recommendation.

FURTHER INFORMATION ABOUT PUBLISHED AND NON-PUBLISHED SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES, AND THE REQUIRED PRESENTATION OF EVIDENCE FOR SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY IN ANNUAL EVALUATIONS AND DOSSIERS

The list below contains, in various parts, information as to how evidence for scholarly activities is to be presented properly and professionally. *The items below pertain not only to materials submitted for annual evaluations conducted by the Chair but must also be included in each dossier the candidate submits during various stages of the retention, tenure, and promotion processes.*

1. **Pedagogy, Linguistics, and Translation:** The departmental *T&P Panel* emphasizes the appropriateness of these fields in the programs represented in the Department. Scholarly activities in these fields should be based on current linguistic theory and/or pedagogical approaches, and make use of empirical data and appropriate scholarly documentation in order to confirm, reject or advance the findings of the project. Unless the presentation is couched within a conceptual framework of theory or methodology, a presentation in which teaching techniques of the presenter (or others) are shared or reported would not be considered scholarly research for tenure-track faculty, and would be more

appropriate for credit in the area of service, particularly in the area of service to the profession.

2. Evidence to be Submitted for Presentations: The departmental *T&P Panel* recognizes that many conferences and workshops prefer that presenters *present* rather than *read* material. The *T&P Panel* requires that a copy of the paper be submitted, even while recognizing that the form of such papers is frequently not that of an article to be submitted for publication consideration (i.e., it is less formal and frequently has emendations). If the presentation was not a paper, a copy of the outline, notes, Power Point presentation, slides, etc. must be submitted as evidence. In requesting such materials, the *T&P Panel* seeks documentary evidence that the presentation was an organized presentation of findings based on research theory and methodology and the individual's professional area of training.
3. Meetings, Conferences, Workshops: Definitions are often unclear, however, "workshops" such as in-service programs for school teachers to upgrade language learning education are fully appropriate to the research and scholarly activities of the disciplines within the Department.
4. Presentations and Papers at Professional Meetings: It is *probable* that a conference that is national or international in scope will have more submissions for its sessions than a regional one, and that furthermore some regions or topics are smaller in scope than others. It is, thus, *probable* that a paper selected for a *larger conference* will have been screened ("refereed"/"juried") more closely and, thus, will have been deemed to be of greater quality. However, the *T&P Panel* is fully aware that many sessions at conferences are pre-arranged among friends — and even more painfully aware that current travel budgets inhibit submissions to distant national and international conferences. Therefore, the *T&P Panel* recognizes that all conference presentations are examples of scholarly activity.
5. Proceedings and Selected Proceedings: Some conferences are selective in establishing a conference program and, consequently, publish all presentations that have made the final cut; other conferences are highly discerning in selecting only the best papers from a large conference to be included in the published "Selected Proceedings;" still other conferences may not be selective at all. Therefore, a general pre-judgment is not appropriate. It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide proper information that helps assess whether the publication was a "refereed/juried publication," an "editorially reviewed publication," or neither.
6. Consulting / Paid Consulting: A clear definition of consulting is difficult at best. Most examples of consulting in the disciplines of this Department (for example, translation, test development, program assessment, work as official language testing personnel or testing coordinator, etc.) probably fall under the category of service and should be recognized as extensions of the faculty member's expertise and training. Sometimes department members are paid for such activities. Occasionally, a significant, publicly disseminated work results (i.e., training or testing materials, computer software or e-

programs, etc.). Such a work could be considered a scholarly activity, within the above guidelines. Even though consulting services may result in financial remuneration to a faculty member, they can still, within reason, be recognized and counted as activities in the area of service or in the area of research and professional development in an annual evaluation, in a third-year-review, in a review for tenure or promotion to any rank, or in a post-tenure review. This policy is consonant with practices in other departments around campus.

DATE OF IMPLEMENTATION

These guidelines and standards were approved by the Department of German and Russian Studies at the College of Charleston on **29 June 2007**. They supersede all previous such criteria, guidelines and standards.