

### **Preamble (for information at September FASS Faculty Council only)**

In the last round of Bargaining, two substantial changes were made to Article 17: a) the expansion of “scholarship” to include “the Boyer model”; b) the recognition of “non-traditional forms of scholarship and traditional ways of knowing.” The Boyer model overlaps significantly with existing definitions of scholarship and teaching excellence, but adds “the Scholarship of Application”—a category that, along with “non-traditional forms of scholarship,” recognizes (in broad terms) what SSHRC calls “knowledge mobilization.” The new Collective Agreement language thus brings us more closely into line with SSHRC granting requirements. “Traditional ways of knowing” also fills a gap for our Faculty by recognizing that Indigenous Studies as a scholarly field includes other forms of knowledge production that are traditional in Indigenous communities (and are also recognized [by SSHRC](#)). These changes affect scholarship and not professional or creative activity.

In developing these revisions, PDC recognized three important audiences for work that falls *only* under the new language in Article 17 (we did not reinvent the wheel on items that were already recognized in Faculty guidelines): i) applicants for tenure and promotion who need guidance on how to organize their file and what evidence to collect for items that fall under only the new language in Article 17; ii) department- and faculty-level PDCs who need guidance on assessment of material that falls only under the new language in Article 17; iii) Chairs who need language that they can share with external assessors who are unfamiliar with the Boyer model and what we recognize as “non-traditional forms of scholarship and traditional ways of knowing” (as appropriate to a particular file). PDC includes in its proposal the requirement that the guidelines be reviewed in two years so that they can be reassessed after two rounds of applications.

The additions below are non-exhaustive, but offer some explanation and illustrative examples for the new additions as well as retain existing language for ongoing categories (e.g., peer-reviewed articles). PDC separated creative from scholarly work because the changes to the Collective Agreement only affect the latter. PDC also advises applicants not to put items in multiple categories (given overlap in the Boyer model with continuing categories, this is a possible pitfall). The revisions below also offer guidance on what sorts of evidence can be used to support items that fall only under the new language.

### **Proposed Revised Guidelines**

**Note: This document is a first effort at reflecting new language in the 2017-20 Collective Agreement by expanding the section, “Contributions to the Discipline” (pp. 93-94 in the current FASS Rules and Procedures). It is to be assessed for effectiveness by PDC in consultation with the Faculty after two years.**

#### **Contributions to the Discipline: Standards and Criteria**

**Assessment of scholarship and/or creative activity:** Scholarship in the broad sense, at least in this Faculty, covers a variety of professional- and discipline-recognized activities involved in the production of publicly recognized forms of academic output and performance.

Recognizing that productivity and qualitative standards of scholarship vary by discipline and Department, the candidate would normally be expected to **provide evidence consistent with disciplinary, Departmental and Faculty standards** in respect to **the quantity, quality and impact** of their individual scholarly and professional contributions to academic and/or public knowledge or discourse.

**Creative work** involves

- a) The **development of, conducting of and participation in creative activity**.
- b) The **solicitation of research or performance funds in support of** creative activity.
- c) The **publication and/or dissemination of creative work** in various forms and formats, sharing the results of creation with one's disciplinary peers or other relevant publics.

### **Scholarly Work**

In the 2017-20 Collective Agreement, the meaning of “scholarship” was expanded: “In keeping with the Boyer model, scholarship includes the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of application and/or the scholarship of teaching” (17.17).

In *Scholarship Reconsidered* (1990; 25-page pdf at <https://depts.washington.edu/g630/Spring/Boyer.pdf>), Ernest L. Boyer defined the “scholarship of discovery” on traditional terms: research that advances knowledge and “is tied inextricably to the freedom to think freshly” (17). The “scholarship of integration” “mean[s] making connections across disciplines, placing the specialties in larger context, illuminating data in a revealing way, often educating nonspecialists too” (18). The “scholarship of application” takes as its premise that “New intellectual understandings can arise out of the very act of application—whether in . . . shaping public policy, creating an architectural design, or working with public schools” and stresses the value of “scholarly service . . . that both applies and contributes to human knowledge” (23). The “scholarship” of teaching acknowledges foundational principles of higher-education pedagogy, including that “Teaching can be well-regarded only as professors are widely read and intellectual engaged” (23), recognizing “the hard work and the serious study that undergirds good teaching” (23), including that “Pedagogical procedures must be carefully planned, continuously examined, and relate directly to the subject taught” (23-24), and that faculty too learn in the classroom and are “pushed in creative new directions” (24).

Examples of these for FASS might include (but are not limited to):

- Scholarship of Discovery: development of a program of research to add to knowledge, including applications for research funds and the publication or other dissemination of results
- Scholarship of Integration: Interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary scholarship, and contributing to nonspecialist education (e.g., advising community groups or government, public documents, from op-eds to blogs to reports, etc., that illustrate the context for an issue, etc.)
- Scholarship of Application: contributions to public policy, service on non-academic boards or committees, arts juries, expert witness testimony, patents, tech development (e.g., apps), research contracts, and knowledge mobilization (as defined by SSHRC, e.g.).
- Scholarship of Teaching: research that went into new course development, pedagogical innovations that arise from pedagogical experiences and evidence, etc. This may overlap

with the teaching dossier, but is an opportunity to address the research and learning that lies at the foundation of that work.

**These categories overlap:** in particular, the Scholarship of Discovery is consistent with the previous definition of scholarship and Scholarship of Teaching is largely covered by “teaching effectiveness.” Scholarship of Integration can overlap with Scholarship of Discovery (e.g., a peer-reviewed article that is interdisciplinary) and with Scholarship of Application (e.g., work on non-specialist education can fit under SSHRC’s definition of knowledge mobilization). Moreover, Scholarship of Application may overlap substantially with creative activity. **It is recommended that candidates put each item where it fits best and note that it fits another category rather than listing items more than once.**

### **Indicators of Academic Research and Scholarship:**

The 2017-20 Collective Agreement also added new language on assessment: “Review and assessment of scholarship should recognize non-traditional forms of scholarship and traditional ways of knowing” (17.17). The first recognizes that some scholarship defined under Boyer’s model will not fall into the conventional categories listed below. For instance, some scholarship of application may not lead to scholarly communication (e.g., community-based research that supports community objectives), new media are reshaping engagement with non-academic audiences (blogs, podcasts, etc.), and so on. The second category reminds us to respect Indigenous ways of knowing, and so fully recognize scholarship that arises from and contributes to knowledge grounded in Indigenous practices and values.

Conventional categories for assessment remain in place, including:

- Peer-reviewed publications or performances**, in disciplinary or peer recognized or reviewed scholarly journals (print or online), monograph or book publishers, venues and productions (and evidence of the impact of these contributions through reviews, citations and translations).
- Other forms of publication or public performance**, peer-reviewed or otherwise, in venues such as podcasts, blogs, policy publications, public concerts, productions, exhibitions, etc.
- Participation** as presenter, panel organizer, panel chair, invited plenary speaker, etc., in **scholarly or professional** conferences, workshops, etc. relevant to one's discipline.
- Active involvement in design, development and participation in **a program of research** as a basis for one's scholarship (either funded or unfunded).
- Indication of work **contributing to one's academic or professional discipline** such as: serving as an official representative on disciplinary organizations or societies, serving on grant committees, editing journals, reviewing articles or monographs for publication, reviewing grant applications, serving as external examiner for tenure and promotion, etc.
- Communication and dissemination of one's scholarship** beyond normal peer or discipline audiences to broader or specific external publics through presentations, reports, publications, exhibitions, performances, compositions, media interviews, published articles, and other forms of knowledge mobilization.

□ **Awards or peer recognition for research or creative activity**, either within or outside of the discipline.

This list is not meant to be exhaustive. Whether additional forms or indicators of scholarship and or performance are presented is left to the judgment of the candidate and whether they are considered relevant is left to the Department. Many of the indicators listed above are broadly recognized indicators of successful contribution to a discipline in a standard application for tenure and/or promotion and would normally constitute recognizable evidence as support for one's contribution to scholarship. **Candidates are free to propose additional or alternative indicators not described here for the consideration as part of their file, but are advised to do so with an explanatory rationale.**

Further Forms of Evidence:

For traditional forms of scholarship and creative activity, we normally reference the required evidence in the entry on a CV, e.g. where a work was published. For items added under the Boyer model as well as non-traditional forms of scholarship and traditional ways of knowing, this practice may not be useful. In such cases, candidates should provide a concise account of the significance and scope of the scholarly activity and aim to provide some evidence and/or external assessment that also speaks to the work's significance and scope. The following examples of evidence and external assessment are meant to be illustrative rather than exhaustive:

- Reviews, citation, published commentary, and translation are just as relevant here as they are for traditional scholarship, though they are less likely to be available
- For scholarship involving a community group: a letter from a member of the community with direct knowledge of the scholarly activity
- For scholarship involving a non-university organization (e.g., a high school, not-for-profit group, library, art group, etc.): a letter from an executive or other leading member of the organization with direct knowledge of the scholarly activity
- For online publications (e.g., a web resource, a blog, a podcast), a sample of materials that can be reviewed by assessors (including external reviewers and the departmental committee) as well as links
- For government work, a letter from the government office most directly involved in the scholarly activity
- For traditional ways of knowing, a letter from an elder or another community representative, as appropriate for both the scholarly activity and the community
- In some instances, a letter from a co-researcher may be considered if it also addresses any conflict-of-interest concerns.

Note: CV information may be provided as a conventional document or through another rubric. FASS does not mandate the use of Uniweb or another platform for the submission of CV information for the purposes of tenure and/or promotion.