



Topics for Department Consideration in Revision of Discipline-Specific Scholarship Standards

Below is a list of topics that a department may wish to consider when revising its discipline-specific scholarship standards. Departments can decide whether or not to address these topics in their standards. In addition, departments can consider additional topics that are not included in this list.

- ☐ Explicit reference is highly recommended to the department's judgment of what constitutes "superior" performance (for tenure and associate rank FH [3.4.2](#)) and "distinguished" performance (for promotion to professor, FH [3.4.2.2](#))
- ☐ University standards are not weakened by discipline-specific standards
- ☐ Disciplinary methods, publication venues, and measures of impact reflect specializations of probationary as well as tenured faculty members
- ☐ External circumstances that impact faculty research and publication, if relevant (e.g., ongoing pandemic impacts, federal funding interruptions)
- ☐ Digital scholarship standards of relevant professional associations are referenced, if relevant for the discipline
- ☐ Measures of quality, as opposed to mere quantity, of publications or creative works
- ☐ Discussion or ranking of publication venues identifies predatory journals and addresses weighting of lower-ranked (e.g., Q2 or Q3) publications along with identification of top-tier venues or appropriate (peer-reviewed) journals for the areas of specialty
- ☐ Identification of the point at which scholarly publications and creative productions are considered "complete" (or "counted" in evaluation and promotion)
- ☐ Discussion of how pre-appointment evidence of certain types is regarded, that is, what factors govern the evaluation of it (quality, rigor, independence). Note: Pre-appointment evidence cannot be ignored (Faculty Handbook [3.4.2](#)).
- ☐ If the department changes the ranking of acceptable scholarly publications, this should be accompanied by an explanation why the publication is being added, removed or reassessed, and evidence to support the change. The explanation is not part of the standards document, but is a supplement for the Dean to help them evaluate the change and decide whether to approve it
- ☐ Discussion of the category (scholarship or teaching) in which presentations or publications with undergraduates counts, and what weight this carries (how important it is to the department)
- ☐ Whether and how "public scholarship" (op-eds, blogs, podcasts, other media appearances, invited talks to non-academic audiences, etc., in which faculty apply their expertise to public issues in public venues) is valued.
- ☐ Criteria weights and differences (if any) are articulated across tenure-stream ranks
- ☐ Evidence that department consultations and votes included all tenure-stream faculty