

Northern Illinois University
Department of English
**PROTOCOL FOR ANNUAL MERIT EVALUATION IN
SCHOLARSHIP AND ARTISTRY**

Updated by the Department Council on 2 May 2007
Revised by the Department Council on November 8, 2005
(Ratings reversed by Office Administrator February 7, 2014)

(Previous Version Approved by the Department Council, May 8, 2002; Original Version
Approved by the Department Council, April 27, 1994)

1) Evaluation of faculty members' scholarship and artistry should aim at arriving at a judgment that reflects the practices and standards appropriate to each individual's specialty. The following are guidelines: they are customary procedures applied with the professional judgment and discretion of the Department Council (hereafter "Council").

2) To arrive at a faculty member's rating, members of the Council shall assess his or her scholarly or artistic activity for the year of evaluation and for the five previous years. (But for newly hired assistant professors, see item 9 below.) In this assessment, the Council members shall employ the table of points and the accompanying rating scale provided in item 10 below.

3) Though a book will normally be awarded 40 points, that number may be raised or lowered according to the following criteria:

a) Whether and to what extent the book is refereed.

b) The prestige of the publisher, ordinarily but not exclusively a university press, in the field in which the book is written. A book in literary theory published by the University of Chicago Press, for example, might merit more than 40 points because of the distinction of the press in this field (and thus the book's likely audience and potential impact).

c) The extent of the faculty member's contribution, whether as author, editor, or translator. A volume in the authoritative edition of a writer might merit more than 40 points; an edition to which the faculty member contributes a brief afterword might merit only 5.

d) The extent to which the book is addressed to experts in its field and appears to make an original contribution to this field. In the case of textbooks, the extent to which the book makes an original and substantive contribution to pedagogy in its field.

e) The number and nature of the reviews, citations, and other forms of recognition the book eventually attracts.

4) Though an article or book chapter will normally be awarded 8 points, that number may be raised or lowered according to the following criteria:

- a) Whether and to what extent the article is refereed.
 - b) The prestige in its field of the publication in which it appears.
 - c) The extent of the faculty member's participation in the article, whether authored or translated.
 - d) The extent to which it appears to make an original contribution to its field, and is addressed to other experts in this field. Thus articles in scholarly journals are likely to merit the greatest number of points; reference work entries based on original research are likely to merit more points than revisions of material in the public domain.
 - e) The number and nature of the reviews, citations, and other forms of recognition the article eventually attracts.
- 5) Points awarded other works of scholarship and artistry—reviews, conference papers, etc.-- may be raised or lowered according to similar criteria.
- 6) Overall ratings may be adjusted downward if the points on which they are based rest largely on minor publications such as conference papers and reviews. Thus, twelve conference papers in the space of two years, though they may together merit 48 points, will probably not by themselves lead to a rating of 5 or even 4.
- 7) To reflect the importance of track records, no overall ratings in scholarship will normally move down more than one rating at any evaluation.
- 8) A rating will not necessarily fall in accordance with the scale below, if one or more of the following circumstances seems to warrant a higher rating: the faculty member has in previous years had a great surplus of points (e.g., from two books published in the same year); the faculty member has served as editor of a journal within the past three years; significant books or articles are known to be accepted and forthcoming; reviews and citations of past work—beyond what is usual for scholarly publications—continue to appear.
- 9) Newly hired assistant professors in a seven-year tenure track line shall receive scholarship ratings no lower than 3 for their first two evaluations. For these first two evaluations they may be (if they choose) and for the third evaluation they shall be evaluated according to the point and scale system established by these protocols, except that the scale shall be adjusted in proportion to the number of years being evaluated. The number of years to be evaluated shall be the choice of the faculty members for their first evaluation and shall increase by one year during each subsequent year.
- 10) Scholarship points and rating scale.

Faculty members have the responsibility of documenting the quality of publications by providing evidence such as the number and nature of reviews of books; acceptance rates and circulation of journals where articles or creative work is published; and/or

explanation of the importance of a given press of journal in the faculty member's field of research and artistry. This evidence should be included with the annual report of scholarship and artistry.

If they have not already done so prior to the review period, faculty members are obliged to deposit copies of all publications with the office of the chair along with their scholarship report. Faculty members are also obliged to see that the file is complete.

Points (points may be raised or lowered in accordance with the criteria specified in ¶s 3-5 above):

Points to be credited for a period of six years:

Authored Book (fiction, nonfiction, poetry).....	40
Play (staged reading, production, printing).....	40
Textbook (until superseded by a new edition)	30
Edited Book	30
Article or book chapter	8
Short story, poetry.....	8

Points to be credited for a period of two years, maximum of 15 points in any one review period:

Review article	8
Review	3
Note.....	1
Reprinted article (or short story, poetry).....	1
Conference paper	4
Appearance as plenary speaker	8
Appearance as panelist, discussant (or artistic equivalent).....	1
Other (awards, prizes, service as referee, citations, retrospective reviews, acknowledgments, etc.).....	At the discretion of the Council

Points to be credited for a period of one year for each current year of activity:

Editorship of a Journal.....	40
Major editorial activities (such as acquisition, evaluation, revision of manuscripts)	15
Major national research grant	30
Minor national research grant (e.g., NEH Summer).....	15
Minor research grant, regional or library (e.g., Lilly Library).....	8

Rating Scale (ratings for each faculty member are based on attaining the minimum points on the following scale, as adjusted according to ¶s 6-9 above):

<u>Total points</u>	<u>Rating</u>
50	5
40	4
25	3
15	2

0

1