

Standards of Scholarship: School of Theology

- **Types of scholarship.** The School of Theology (SOT) values all four kinds of scholarly activity as currently defined by the handbook. The School of Theology recognizes that different scholarly activity is relative to a diversity of interest, talent, calling, vocational orientation and departmental emphasis.
- **Principal scholarly products.** The following **artifacts of scholarly productivity** are examples apropos to the theological disciplines:
 1. Monographs, books, commentaries
 2. Editor of or contributor to collection of scholarly articles
 3. Articles in peer reviewed, indexed journals
 4. Textbooks, curricula for classroom and church
 5. Non-technical articles in church-related publications (e.g., Christian Century, Christianity Today)
 6. Publication of scholarship in non-print media, including electronic journals, computer programs, plays, film or documentary, video, CD, and radio programs

In addition to the candidate's published work catalogued above, the following examples of **professional activities** may supply supporting evidence of development and achievement as a scholar:

1. Presentations at regional/national/international conferences of scholars or clergy
 2. Multimedia performances of research
 3. Author of research grants that contribute to scholarly or curricular product
 4. Course syllabi and student reviews of an instructor's effective use of research in the classroom
 5. Article-length book reviews written for peer-reviewed, indexed journals
 6. Consultancy papers written for theological commissions of church-related groups
- **Peer review of candidate's scholarship.** Collegial review of a candidate's body of published work aims to determine the *quality* of one's scholarly contribution, including but not limited to its originality and usefulness to one's disciplinary peers and students. A body of work that includes interdisciplinary research as well as a diversity of scholarly products that reflects different audiences, methodologies, and educational purpose are highly valued within our School. Citations and reviews of one's work by other scholars, along with awards and other recognition, sometimes provides valuable evidence that confirms the quality and contribution of one's scholarly work. For tenure and promotion in rank, SOT peer review will include at least one written evaluation of a candidate's scholarship from disciplinary peers of other institutions according to standards apropos to the status or rank sought. A list of possible external reviewers should be suggested by the candidate and selected by the School dean.
 - **Typology of the productive scholar.** The trajectory of one's professional development as a teaching scholar is monitored within SOT by the annual assessment of the PDP. This mechanism insures a colleague's scholarly productivity is carefully

regulated in conversation with the dean and department chair and properly focused on preparing for the normal peer review processes. SOT's expectation is that a colleague's scholarly trajectory will include on average one peer-reviewed journal article or its equivalent per each academic year. The "moments" that plot collegial review, respective of a colleague's development as a scholar, include the following. The determination of whether a colleague's scholarship is "sufficient" for tenure or promotion in rank is, of course, the objective of careful and critical peer review of a body of scholarly artifacts and activities congruent with the above catalogues.

1. **Third-year review.** Scholarship standards that commend a colleague's continuance toward tenure include: (1) There must be clear evidence that a candidate has the talent and intention of meeting SOT's scholarly standards for tenure and the rank of Associate Professor (see below). (2) For those candidates at the rank of Assistant Professor, peer review will primarily concentrate on one's *potential* as a scholar as evinced by a detailed research program included in one's file and supported by a body of completed work either accepted or published since arriving at SPU. (3) In addition, candidates should delineate the different ways in which one's research can be or has been adapted to the classroom.
2. **Tenure.** Scholarship standards that commend a colleague's tenure include: (1) A narrative that clearly relates one's sense of vocation, integral to SPU's mission statement, with a research agenda apropos to one's theological discipline. This narrative must be added to a SOT candidate's tenure file. (2) Sufficient evidence of continuing development and productivity as a scholar. (3) Evidence that one's scholarship, even if tacit, is brought into the classroom to introduce and excite students to the ideas of a theological discipline.
3. **Associate Professor.** Scholarship standards that commend a colleague's promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor include: (1) Sufficient evidence of continuing development and productivity as a scholar beyond the rank of Assistant Professor as determined by peer review, including but not limited to School faculty who hold the rank of Associate and Professor. (2) The promotion file must include a narrative that plots the formation of a distinctive "voice" or contribution to one's discipline. This narrative should normally be supported/illustrated by reference to journal articles or monograph in which this contribution is made.
4. **Professor.** SOT faculty heartily affirms and honors those colleagues whose sense of calling and professional development are focused on the classroom or service to the university rather than on scholarly production. At the same time, the School's recommendation for promotion to Professor requires a substantial body of scholarly work that meet the following standards: (1) Sufficient evidence of continuing development and productivity as a scholar beyond the rank of Associate Professor as determined by peer review, including but not limited to School faculty who hold the rank of Professor. (2) The promotion file must include a record of leadership within one's disciplinary guild and the testimony of peers that the candidate is a recognized national authority within one's discipline.