

RTP Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement Guidelines
Department of English and Comparative Literature

Approved by Department of English and Comparative Literature vote,
17 (yes) – 0 (no) on May 31, 2016. Effective August 22, 2016

Literature

The Department of English and Comparative Literature at San Jose State University values the intersection of teaching (academic assignment), scholarly/creative work (Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement), and service to the department, college, and university in its tenure and promotion processes. The Department values a wide variety of scholarly, creative, and professional writing. In keeping with the University Policy S15-17, these guidelines are meant to be inclusive and non-exclusive in nature; they are not meant to exclude accomplishments if those accomplishments do not specifically appear in these guidelines (S15-17, 4.2.2). The current University RTP document sets standards of “baseline,” “good,” and “excellent” in the review of the three areas of teaching, scholarly/creative work, and service. This document establishes the standards of “baseline,” “good,” and “excellent” in the various subfields within the department: Literature; Composition; English Education; Creative Writing. It has established these in keeping with the availability of resources in the department, including the current teaching load and the limited availability of funds for research and travel (S15-18, 2.3.6.1)

This document will delineate the standards for **Literature** faculty. Faculty members may work across fields, in which case the relevant field standards will be included. Total research/creative activity should be evaluated in light of the combined work across fields.

For the purposes of assigning candidates to the following categories, articles or a monograph in press (final version submitted to publisher) will be equivalent to work in print. For work that is under contract, but not in press, the completion of connected grant work can help establish the candidate's position within these categories.

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor or Professor:

General Guidelines

The main form of scholarly/creative work (Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement) for literary scholars include articles, book chapters, books, and textbooks. These scholarly contributions will usually be peer or editorially reviewed. Peer reviewed work will be assessed by a reviewer who is not directly involved in the editing process (is not the editor of a journal). In other cases, as in book chapters in an essay collection, the editor her/himself would provide the

review. In both cases, judgment of the work would be rendered by a qualified scholar. For publications, work can either be published or in press (final version submitted to publisher). In cases in which the publication has been accepted, but not yet appeared in print, documentation is required to substantiate the acceptance and the “in press” status of the work.

The department expects that junior faculty will place a reasonable number of peer-reviewed or editorially-reviewed articles or book chapters in scholarly venues in the course of their probationary time period; this output should substantiate a record of continual scholarly activity. The department expects that an associate faculty member will continue to develop their research. A book project might grow out of earlier articles. An associate professor might also take on alternate ways of representing their research, such as a literary database, a significant editing project, or new media project. The collective nature of the full research project will be explicitly considered when reviewing a faculty member for promotion to full professor.

We acknowledge the value of co-authorship. In the field of **Literature**, there is no disciplinarily consistent protocol that dictates the order of names listed in a publication. In the case of any co-authored, or co-edited, publications, the candidate will detail the terms of their contribution. This will help determine the weight the publication will be given in meeting the stated tenure standards.

Print and electronic publication will be considered equivalent, based on the competitiveness of the review process.

RSCA Standards

Baseline: 2 published articles or book chapters that have been peer or editorially reviewed along with evidence of ongoing work, such as: a body of academic writing (book/theater/exhibit reviews); significant conference presentations or invited talks; or the award of an external grant.

Good: 3-4 published articles that have been peer or editorially reviewed.

Excellent: A published monograph or 5 published articles or that have gone through a peer or editorial review process.

Additional Forms of Scholarly Production

Intellectual creative work (editing a journal; editing a special issue of a journal; editing a monograph-length collection of essays; producing a literary edition) is counted as scholarly production at an appropriate portion of an original article or monograph.

Substantial book/theater/exhibit reviews, interviews, encyclopedia entries, short published pieces of 2-5 pages, or other public academic writing in a peer or editorially reviewed venue will count as 1/4 to 1/2 of an article. Normal standards of selection will apply. A successful tenure/promotion bid would be unlikely if these forms of published work will make up the majority of one's published materials presented for tenure and/or promotion. In no cases would a candidate be considered "baseline" if they had fewer than 2 articles or book chapters for tenure or promotion.

Significance of Venue as an evaluative factor

While these numbers of publications help establish a standard, the quality, breadth, and level of selectivity in publication will weigh into the assignment of "baseline," "good, or "excellent" to a candidate's dossier. For example, two articles in highly competitive journals might well be ranked as "Good" rather than "Baseline"; 6 very short articles that were limited in scope might be considered "Good" rather than Excellent. Selectivity will be determined by acceptance rates, circulation, and other appropriate forms of assessing impact. Additionally, the substantiated reputation of presses and journals will weigh into the evaluation of selectivity. The candidate for tenure and/or promotion will be expected to provide a detailed accounting of the quality of the publications, and caliber of the journals, the relative standings of the presses, etc.

DOCUMENT

RTP Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement Guidelines
Department of English and Comparative Literature

Approved by Department of English and Comparative Literature vote,
17 (yes) – 0 (no) on May 31, 2016. Effective August 22, 2016

Rhetoric/Composition and English Education

The Department of English and Comparative Literature at San Jose State University values the intersection of teaching (academic assignment), scholarly/creative work (Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement), and service to the department, college, and university in its tenure and promotion processes. The Department values a wide variety of scholarly, creative, and professional writing. In keeping with the University Policy S15-17, these guidelines are meant to be inclusive and non-exclusive in nature; they are not meant to exclude accomplishments if those accomplishments do not specifically appear in these guidelines (S15-17, 4.2.2). The current University RTP document sets standards of “baseline,” “good,” and “excellent” in the review of the three areas of teaching, scholarly/creative work, and service. This document establishes the standards of “baseline,” “good,” and “excellent” in the various subfields within the department: Literature; Composition; English Education; Creative Writing. It has established these in keeping with the availability of resources in the department, including the current teaching load and the limited availability of funds for research and travel (S15-18, 2.3.6.1)

This document will delineate the standards for **Rhetoric/Composition and English Education** faculty. Faculty members may work across fields, in which case the relevant field standards will be included. Total research/creative activity should be evaluated in light of the combined work across fields.

For the purposes of assigning candidates to the following categories, articles or a monograph in press (final version submitted to publisher) will be equivalent to work in print. For work that is under contract, but not in press, the completion of connected grant work can help establish the candidate's position within these categories.

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor or Professor:

General Guidelines

The main forms of scholarly/creative work (Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement) for rhetoric and composition scholars include articles, book chapters, books, textbooks, grant-writing, and professional documentation (e.g. handbooks), and program direction and development. These scholarly contributions will usually be peer or editorially reviewed. Peer reviewed work will be assessed by reviewers who are not directly involved in the editing process (i.e., is not the editor of a

journal). In other cases, as in book chapters in an essay collection, the editor her/himself would provide the review. In both cases, judgment of the work would be rendered by a qualified scholar. For publications, work can either be published or in press (final version submitted to publisher). In cases in which the publication has been accepted, but not yet appeared in print, documentation is required to substantiate the acceptance and the “in press” status of the work.

The department expects that junior faculty will place a reasonable number of peer-reviewed or editorially-reviewed articles or book chapters in scholarly venues in the course of their probationary time period; this output should substantiate a record of continual scholarly activity. The department expects that an associate faculty member will continue to develop their research. A book project might grow out of earlier articles. A new administrative role might be taken on. An associate professor might also take on alternate ways of representing their research, such as a large grant project. The collective nature of the full research project will be explicitly considered when reviewing a faculty member for promotion to full. In all cases, another significant research project, such as a major grant and its administration, or another significant administrative role, could be substituted for a monograph or a range of articles or book chapters, depending on the scope of the project.

We acknowledge the value of co-authorship in the field of **Rhetoric/Composition and English Education**. This position is in line with the Conference on College Composition and Communication’s position statement on Scholarship in Composition, which states “a significant percentage of the scholarship in composition studies is being conducted and reported collaboratively” and “collaborative work, while having a long tradition in many disciplines, should be respected as a legitimate and appropriate form of professional scholarly activity.” There is no disciplinarily consistent protocol that dictates the order of names listed in a publication. In the case of any co-authored, or co-edited, publications, the candidate will detail the terms of their contribution. This will help determine the weight the publication will be given in meeting the stated tenure standards.

In addition, we value the administration and development of writing programs as intellectual work and consider all documents, materials, and resources related to this work as Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement.

Print and electronic publication will be considered equivalent, based on the competitiveness of the review process.

RSCA Standards

Baseline: 2 published articles or book chapters that have been peer or editorially reviewed along with evidence of ongoing work which could include: high quality

professional documentation; a significant amount of high quality materials related to program administration; or the award of an external grant.

Good: 3-4 published articles that have been peer or editorially reviewed. A significant amount of high quality professional documentation, a significant amount of high quality materials related to program administration, or the award of a significant external grant (based on reputation, impact, and/or financial award) could substitute for one of the articles.

Excellent: A published monograph or 5 published articles or that have gone through a peer or editorial review process. A significant amount of high quality professional documentation, a significant amount of high quality materials related to program administration, or the award of a highly significant external grant (based on reputation, impact, and/or financial award) could substitute for up to two of the articles.

Additional Forms of Scholarly Production

Intellectual creative work (editing a journal; editing a special issue of a journal; editing a monograph-length collection of essays; producing a literary edition) is counted as scholarly production at an appropriate portion of an original article or monograph.

Substantial book reviews, interviews, or other public academic writing in a peer or editorially reviewed venue will count as 1/4 to 1/2 of an article. Normal standards of selection will apply. A successful tenure/promotion bid would be unlikely if these forms of published work will make up the majority of one's published materials presented for tenure and/or promotion. In NO cases would a candidate be considered "baseline" if they had fewer than 2 articles or book chapters for tenure or promotion.

Significance of Venue as an evaluative factor

While these numbers of publications help establish a standard, the quality, breadth, and level of selectivity in publication will weigh into the assignment of "baseline," "good," or "excellent" to a candidate's dossier. For example, two articles in highly competitive journals might well be ranked as "Good" rather than "Baseline"; 6 very short articles that were limited in scope might be considered "Good" rather than Excellent. Selectivity will be determined by acceptance rates, circulation, and other appropriate forms of assessing impact. Additionally, the substantiated reputation of presses and journals will weigh into the evaluation of selectivity. The candidate for tenure and/or promotion will be expected to provide a detailed accounting of the quality of the publications, the caliber of the journals, the relative standings of the presses, the significance of a grant, etc.

RTP Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement Guidelines
Department of English and Comparative Literature

Approved by Department of English and Comparative Literature vote, 17 (yes) – 0 (no) on May 31, 2016. Effective August 22, 2016

Creative Writing

The Department of English and Comparative Literature at San Jose State University values the intersection of teaching (academic assignment), scholarly/creative work (Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement), and service to the department, college, and university in its tenure and promotion processes. The Department values a wide variety of scholarly, creative, and professional writing. In keeping with the University Policy S15-17, these guidelines are meant to be inclusive and non-exclusive in nature; they are not meant to exclude accomplishments if those accomplishments do not specifically appear in these guidelines (S15-17, 4.2.2). The current University RTP document sets standards of “baseline,” “good,” and “excellent” in the review of the three areas of teaching, scholarly/creative work, and service. This document establishes the standards of “baseline,” “good,” and “excellent” in the various subfields within the department: Literature; Composition; English Education; Creative Writing. It has established these in keeping with the availability of resources in the department, including the current teaching load and the limited availability of funds for research and travel (S15-18, 2.3.6.1)

This document will delineate the standards for **Creative Writing** faculty. Faculty members may work across fields, in which case the relevant field standards will be included. Total research/creative activity should be evaluated in light of the combined work across fields.

For the purposes of assigning candidates to the following categories, articles or a monograph in press (final version submitted to publisher) will be equivalent to work in print. For work that is under contract, but not in press, the completion of connected grant work can help establish the candidate's position within these categories.

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor or Professor:

General Guidelines

The main form of scholarly/creative work (Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement) for creative writers includes poems, chapbooks, poetry collections, short stories, excerpts from a novel (which will be viewed as the equivalent of a single short story), novels, nonfiction books, interviews, feature articles, essays, and book reviews. These creative contributions will usually be peer or editorially reviewed. Peer reviewed work will be assessed by reviewers who are not directly involved in the editing process (is not the editor of a journal). In the case of most

literary journals or publishing houses, the editor her/himself would provide the review. In both cases, judgment of the work would be rendered by a qualified reviewer. For publications, work can either be published or in press (final version submitted to publisher). In cases in which the publication has been accepted, but not yet appeared in print, documentation is required to substantiate the acceptance and the “in press” status of the work.

The department expects that junior faculty will place a reasonable number of editorially reviewed creative pieces in the course of their probationary time period; this output should substantiate a record of continual scholarly activity.

The department expects that an associate faculty member will continue to develop creatively. A novel might evolve out of shorter publications; a full-length nonfiction work might develop out of a range of feature articles. An associate professor might also take on alternate ways of developing their craft, such as founding and editing a journal. The collective nature of the full creative or research project will be explicitly considered when reviewing a faculty member for promotion to full.

RSCA Standards

Baseline: A substantial number (8 -10) of published poems in reputable print or online journals; 3 short stories or portions of a novel; 3 substantial feature-length creative nonfiction pieces (essays, feature articles, cultural or literary criticism) in substantive publications; or a combination of work from across genres that represents a comparable body of work.

Good: A published chapbook of poems; 4 published short stories and/or portions of a novel; 4 published feature-length creative nonfiction pieces of 2000 words or more in substantive publications; or a combination of published work across genres that represents a comparable body of work.

Excellent: A published full-length collection of poetry; a published novel; a published book-length creative nonfiction work; or a combination of published work across genres that represents a comparable body of work.

Additional Forms of Scholarly Production

Intellectual creative work (editing a journal; editing a special issue of a journal; editing a book-length collection of essays; producing a literary edition) is counted as creative productivity at an appropriate portion of original creative output.

Substantial book reviews, interviews, or other public academic writing in a juried or editorially reviewed venue will count as $\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$ of an article. Normal standards of selection will apply. A successful tenure/promotion bid would be unlikely if these forms of published work will make up the majority of one’s published materials presented for tenure and/or promotion.

Significance of Venue as an evaluative factor

While these numbers of publications help establish a standard, the quality, breadth, the level of selectivity of the publication will also weigh into the assessment of “baseline,” “good, or “excellent.” Eight poems in highly competitive literary magazines might well be ranked as “Good” rather than “Baseline,” while 6 very short feature articles that were limited in scope might be considered “Good” rather than “Excellent.” Length of a book manuscript or poems will also weigh in the evaluation, and could definitely modify specific number ranges, particularly in terms the length and ambition of individual poems. Types of publication -- small presses, major magazines-- can have selectivity rates determined by: circulation; acceptance rates; sales records, substantiated reputation; reviews in established venues; and awards given by publishing venues or reputable literary organizations. The candidate for tenure and/or promotion will be expected to provide a detailed accounting of the quality of the publications, and caliber of the journals, the relative standings of the presses, etc.

RETIRED

DOCUMENT