

# AUTHORS

Research and poster: Cam Davis

Scholarship Rubric: Aaron Huffman and Cam Davis

Cedarville University

# ABSTRACT

This poster presentation takes a look at various scholarship requirements from a variety of universities. Standards vary in both the quantitative and qualitative nature of the work. Is all scholarly and creative work created equal? How should value be assigned to varying works produced by the faculty member? The department for the creative disciplines for this university recently examined the standards of scholarship for its own faculty with the intent to both educate and assist the department and university tenure and promotion committees in knowing what progressively advancing scholarship should look like. The new scholarship model shows a unique method for evaluation of the work produced by its faculty. It is simple, practical and streamlined. The newly created model will be highlighted along with a look at other college scholarship models.

**5% DID NOT OFFER TENURE OR PROMOTION**

# RESEARCH

This research entails a comparison of the criteria for scholarship for full professor required for advancement across a variety of higher education institutions. The questions to be answered were; How succinctly do colleges and universities define the requirements for scholarship? Are there included both quantitative as well as qualitative requirements? Are the definitions broadly interpreted or are the requirements specific?

# METHODS

In order to have data from a variety of sources, information was collected from four different categories of institutions:

- 1) Four year public (large, > 25K)
- 2) Four year public (small, < 25K)
- 4) Four year private
- 5) Four year Art and Design

There were four schools chosen from each category to compare ... 16 total.

The data was compared and analyzed as to the quantitative and qualitative content, to detect similarities as well as differences.

This researcher, along with a colleague, produced a redesigned model/rubric for scholarship which would apply to the Department of Art, Design and Theater at Cedarville Uni-

SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY	CATEGORY	Degree of PEER REVIEW	Prestige	Significance of WORK OUTPUT	Level of role/responsibility/activity/INVOLVEMENT	Total Points
	Discovery	1: Client or non-expert	1: Local scope or equivalent	1: Low	1: Assistant	
	Application	2: Professional or Academic	2: Regional scope or equivalent	2: Medium	2: Primary	
	Teaching	3: Highest form for category	3: National/Intl. scope or equiv.	3: High	3: Manager	
	Integration					
<b>Traditional Academic Activity:</b>						
Published, authored book or chapter within one's discipline or pedagogy						
Published journal article, critique, essay, or book review						
Conference presentation/poster	D	2	3	2	2	9
Published compilation of professional work (visual art/design, visual theatre) in publications related to one's discipline						
Grants/Awards						
<b>Creative Works:</b>						
National recognition for directing, dramaturgy, performance, or design						
Regional recognition for directing, dramaturgy, performance, or design (LORT)						
Professional/Commissioned work	A	1	2	2	2	7
Guest lecture, seminar, or workshop within one's discipline or pedagogy						
Community or summer stock direct, performance, or design						
Guest director, designer, artist, or residency						
<b>Academic/Professional Support:</b>						
Coordinate/plan event						
Panelist, consultant, critic, or adjudicator for professional, educational, or arts organization						
Publication support requiring professional expertise—e.g. editing a professional publication or book						
Office in professional or educational organization	A	2	3	1	1	7
Leadership or significant visibility in Internet-based forums with a significant level/quality of interaction from the professional community (e.g., blogs, podcasts, webinars, etc.)						
Conference paper or panel reviewer						
<b>Total</b>						<b>23</b>
Note: All scholarly activity should relate to one's discipline, pedagogy, and/or biblical integration.						

versity. The model is not a university-wide model. It is to be used within the department to provide guidance for tenure-seeking faculty. It will be presented to the tenure committee at large to educate that body on requirements for our discipline so as to fairly and objectively evaluate tenure candidates.

**95% DO NOT DEFINE QUANTITATIVE VALUES**

# RUBRIC EXPLAINED

The Davis Huffman Rubric takes into account five areas of evaluation; Category, Degree of Peer Review, Prestige/Scope, Work Output, and Level of Involvement. Except for the Category, the work produced will be given a value from one to three according to the level of achievement or scope. A numeric value is then totaled. Each work produced is evaluated in this way.

The tenure-track candidate is evaluated every two years in a six-year track. There will

be a minimum of points required for each two-year cycle, and progresses and accumulates toward the final sixth year evaluation.

The expectations for point accumulation are as follows:

- 2 year - 30 points
- 4 year - 70 points
- 6 year - 100 points

## RUBRIC EXAMPLE

The example shown on the rubric shows how it might be used for planning by a tenure candidate.

Candidate A has the following:

1. A paper was accepted and presented at a national forum. It was peer reviewed. The amount of work involved was significant but not extensive. The person was the primary researcher but did not need to lead a team. Total points were 9.

2. Being a designer, Candidate A landed a branding job for a regional store or chain. He was hired by the client. There was a fair amount of work involved which they did themselves. The total point value assigned to this project was 7.

3. An office on a committee for a national organization was obtained. The activity level was low and would be considered as assisting others. There were 7 points given for this work.

As this person was up for a two-year review, this would be useful for planning, as the total of 23 points would fall short of the expected 30 points. Other work could be sought out to fill out the requirements.

# CONCLUSIONS

Every institution rightfully wants to see it's faculty progress to a place of prominence in their field, to produce new knowledge about the discipline, and impact a broad audience nationally or internationally from their work.

There was a wide variety of expectations expressed for promotion and/or tenure advancement. The range extended from an expectation of quality engagement through the attainment of national and international prominence and recognition in the design community.

All institutions outlined suggested areas of involvement and activity such as publication, consulting, independent design work, grants and research. All of the schools offered promotion and/or tenure except one.

There were two specific questions this researcher wanted to examine. The first question was how much subjectivity versus objectivity would be included in the evaluations. There is the potential for a wide range of subjectivity when determining "eminence," "authoritative," "increasing reputation," etc. So, the conclusion is that the level of subjectivity was fairly high across the board.

Another question to examine is whether any work created on a more localized or regional scale could obtain a positive assessment according to examined materials. Are the works created for a national audience the only ones to be considered?

Most institutions focused almost solely on creative work done for clients with national or international prominence. Occasionally, the term "regional," describing scope or prestige, was mentioned. It is certainly a worthwhile to set lofty goals for scholarship.

This researcher believes that worthwhile contributions can be made to the discipline even if the scale is not as far-reaching and should receive some consideration.

## RUBRIC CONCLUSIONS

The Davis Huffman Rubric shown here attempts to take into account a variety of efforts from local/regional through international, and assigns appropriate value through that range. The rubric gives consideration to both quality as well as quantity of creative, scholarly activity. Additionally, there is a balance between concrete, objective definitions with subjective evaluations of the significance of the work.

The rubric is designed to serve as a guide to help in a practical manner for tenure-seeking faculty.