1 Introduction

Memorial University is a diverse community of people who engage in many forms of research, scholarship, and creative activity. In addition, Memorial recognizes its special obligation to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador; within this context, research often entails engagement.

What qualities of research do we value? How do we know we are successful? As a community of arts, humanities and social sciences researchers, it is our responsibility to show how we achieve excellence in what we value.

It is clear that, with the diversity of research outputs — including scholarship and creative practice — for the arts, humanities and social sciences, quantitative measures are insufficient indicators of research quality.

The Faculty of Arts undertook a process of research and consultation to discover if, when, and how we might best account for and represent our research successes.

Drawing on the experience of other institutions and on existing literature, and through consultation with Memorial faculty in the arts, humanities and social sciences, our goal was to find ways to communicate our success and excellence in research, scholarship, and creative activity.

To accomplish our goal, we engaged in an extensive consultation process, described in Appendix B (§9). The questions for consultation were:

- What do we value in our research, scholarship, and creative practice?
- What research, scholarship, and creative practice in our Academic Unit is special? How is it special? Why is it special?
- What are the best ways to describe and assess our research, scholarship, and creative practice?
- How can we most effectively gauge our success?

The present document is an interpretation of Appendix B (§9): Capturing Research Success — Notes from Consultative Meetings, and was written by Carrie Dyck, with input and guidance from Lynne Phillips. The document was then revised by Carrie Dyck, taking into account departmental submissions made in response to the first draft.
2 Research in Memorial’s Faculty of Arts

Faculty of Arts (Social Sciences and Humanities) researchers are actively engaged in wide ranging and diverse projects. Some great examples are provided below, as well as in one of our recent editions of Research Matters or our February 2013 enewsletter. The latter provides an overview of the projects for which Arts researchers were awarded $7,486,472 in funding in 2011-12 from: the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC), The Canadian Foundation for Innovation (CFI), The Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency (ACOA), and the NL Government’s Research Development Corporation. To demonstrate the range and diversity of research in the Faculty of Arts, we list below a few examples of what researchers are doing in each Arts department.

Anthropology
Sharon Roseman; the concept of ‘new ruralities’, particularly in Galicia, an Atlantic region in northwestern Spain.
Robin Whitaker; the post-Agreement context of the 1998 Belfast or Good Friday Agreement.

Archaeology
Barry Gaulton; excavation of Ferryland, Newfoundland focussing on George Calvert's colony of Avalon (1621) and the subsequent plantation established by Sir David Kirke in 1638.
Lisa Rankin; Understanding the Past to Build the Future (the long-term cultural and social history of the Inuit Métis of southern Labrador).

Classics
Craig Maynes; how hunting images reflect Roman aristocracy, who hunted not to survive but to advertise their wealth.
Milo Nikolic; ancient technology and technical literature, specifically Ancient Greek and Roman water-supply systems, from an Engineering perspective.

Economics
Scott Lynch; Collaborative Applied Research in Economics (CARE) on topics relevant to Newfoundland and Labrador.
Doug May; Community Accounts, a university/community-populated database of wellbeing indicators, with an example from Branch, NL.

English Language and Literature
Mary Dalton; creative writing; see Hooking, a collection of centos and collage forms with ancient antecedents.
Andrew Loman, Nancy Pedri; Studies of Visual Narrative (visual and intermedial storytelling, including graphic novel narratives).
Folklore
Cory Thorne; an oral history of the Newfoundland military bride community in Virginia.
Jillian Gould; Jewish courtship narratives and dating rituals.

French and Spanish
Philippe Basabose; the literature and theory of violence, especially pertaining to the Rwandan genocide.
Maureen Scheidnes; second language acquisition in typically developing children and first language acquisition in children with specific language impairment.

Gender Studies
Sonja Boon; feminist theory and the body.
Katherine Side; definitions and applications of citizenships rights, including social, political and civil citizenship rights, reproductive rights and human rights in Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland.

Geography
Arn Keeling (with John Sandlos, History); the legacy of abandoned mines in Northern Canada
Josh Lepawsky; mapping the international trade and traffic of electronic waste.

German and Russian
John Buffinga; the history of German film
Jean Snook; making the works of Germanic authors accessible in English through award-winning translations.

History
Marica Cassis; Byzantine and Syriac Christian history and archaeology; Islamic-Christian interaction.
Mark Humphries; military operations of the First World War

Linguistics
Julie Brittain; first language acquisition in East Cree (Algonquian).
Yvan Rose; developing an open-source software program for the elaboration and compilation of phonological data corpora.

Philosophy
Sean McGrath; German philosophy, particularly that of Martin Heidegger.
Arthur Sullivan; the theory of reference and theory of content within the philosophy of language.
Political Science

*Miriam Anderson*; transnational advocacy networks’ impact on peace agreements and the importance of international norms in post-conflict states.

*Alex Marland*; political marketing and election campaigning (including a paper co-authored with Matthew Kerby on the role of open-line radio in Newfoundland and Labrador politics).

Religious Studies

*Patricia Dold and Jennifer Selby*; *religion, culture and diversity* in St. John’s, NL.

*Kim Parker*; Early Modern Thought, Hebrew Bible and Hebraic Political Philosophy.

*Hans Rollmann*; Religious History of Newfoundland and Labrador; History of the Stone-Campbell Movement in the U.S.

Sociology

*Lisa Kaida*; immigrant integration within broad social and labour market changes in the host countries; integration of low wage and low family income new immigrants to Canada.

*Barbara Neis*; the health and environmental consequences of socio-economic change; occupational health in fishing and shellfish processing; gender, fisheries and globalization; and fish harvesters’ ecological knowledge.

The Faculty of Arts hosts four of Memorial’s seventeen Canada Research Chairs, including a Tier One chair in *North Atlantic Archaeology*, and Tier Two Chairs in *Aboriginal Studies* (Anthropology), *Natural Resource Sustainability and Community Development* (Geography), and *Regional Language and Oral Text* (Linguistics). Arts is also proud to host the *Stephen Jarislowsky Chair* in Economic and Cultural Transformation.

Arts faculty regularly receive provincial, national, and international recognition for their research achievements. For example, at the 2013 celebration of Arts research, entitled *A Fine Crowd*, Memorial’s President and the Dean of Arts acknowledged the recipients of the *Queen Elizabeth II Diamond Jubilee Medals* (Barb Neis, Ron Rompkey, Doug House, and Wade Locke), the *Order of Canada* (Bev Diamond), the *Royal Society of Canada* (Peter Pope) and the *President’s Awards for Outstanding Research* (Sean McGrath). As well, since 1984-5, twenty of the fifty-eight *University Research professorships*, awarded at Memorial in recognition of research “of a truly international stature” have gone to faculty members in Arts. (Please see the complete list of *past winners*.)

Arts graduate students are integrally involved in research. For example, in recognition of their academic excellence as researchers, in the 2011-12 academic year, Arts graduate students received twelve SSHRC Joseph Armand Bombardier MA Fellowships, two SSHRC Joseph Armand
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Bombardier PhD Fellowships, one SSHRC Doctoral fellowship, two ISER doctoral fellowships, three ISER masters’ fellowships, four School of Graduate Studies F.A. Aldrich fellowships, one SSHRC Vanier graduate scholarship, one SSHRC Trudeau doctoral fellowship, thirty-one awards for the Fellow of the School of Graduate Studies, and thirteen other awards.

Arts faculty and graduate students are deeply committed to public engagement. Here are but a few examples: Marguerite MacKenzie (Linguistics) is featured on Memorial’s Public Engagement website for her work in producing a Pan-Innu dictionary for Innu speakers in Labrador and Québec (http://www.mun.ca/publicengagement/stories/innu.php). Alistair Bath (Geography) is internationally recognized for his applied human dimensions facilitated workshop approach to developing plans to manage the spaces shared by humans and wildlife, particularly large carnivores (http://www.mun.ca/gazette/issues/vol44no13/polarbears.php). Barb Neis (Sociology), through the model for community-engaged/partnered research and knowledge mobilization developed by SafetyNet, produced an award-winning documentary, Changing Tides: Gender, Fisheries and Globalization, which resulted from a symposium that involved researchers from universities and NGOs in 18 countries, and women fishworkers from Atlantic Canada. Trevor Bell (Geography) and Kelly Vodden (Geography, Grenfell Campus), recognized for their expertise in engagement, offered workshops on public engagement at the launch of MUN’s engagement framework in February 2013 (https://www.mun.ca/geog/news.php?id=1587). And finally, Rachel Hirsch (2012 Labrador Institute postdoc) collaboratively developed a Community Freezer Program to provide the Nain community with access to country foods such as caribou, seal, Arctic hare, Arctic char and polar bear. http://www.mun.ca/gazette/issues/vol44no11/food.php.

Memorial University and the Faculty of Arts hosts a diverse range of facilities to serve Arts researchers, including the new Memorial Statistics Canada Research Data Centre (established initially with funding support from the VP(Research)), and the Faculty of Art’s Digital Research Centre for Qualitative Research (established initially with funding support from CFI, ACOA, Faculty of Arts, Office of the VP(Research), and Aliant Telecom). The Faculty of Arts also has approximately twenty-five research spaces, consisting of laboratories, reading rooms or libraries, and computing facilities. These spaces host for research on such diverse topics as Aboriginal languages and cultures, tree ring sampling, e-waste, archaeological conservation, and natural resource sustainability and community development.

The Faculty of Arts boasts a longstanding and distinguished publishing tradition. ISER Books, the publishing arm of the Institute of Social and Economic Research was established in 1961, and its mandate is to foster social and economic research deemed of relevance to Newfoundland and Labrador and the broader Atlantic world. The latest book, I Never Knowed It Was Hard:
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*Memoirs of a Labrador Trapper* by Louie Montagne was first published in 2013, and is already in its second printing.

**MUN Folklore and Language Publications**, publishes significant works on folkloristics, especially those relevant to Newfoundland and Labrador; recent publications include *Sonny's Dream: Essays on Newfoundland Folklore and Popular Culture* by the late Peter Narváez.

Arts faculty are also integrally involved in publishing and editing journals, serving on editorial boards, and editing book series. For example, *Arts faculty* members figure heavily in the editorial board of the *The Journal of Newfoundland and Labrador Studies* (formerly, *The Journal of Newfoundland Studies*), which is devoted to publishing about the society and culture of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Arts faculty also produce open-access journals, which are largely hosted at the Queen Elizabeth II Library: [http://guides.library.mun.ca/ojs](http://guides.library.mun.ca/ojs). *Analecta Hermeneutica* (Editor, S McGrath, Philosophy) is “the annual refereed journal of the International Institute for Hermeneutics (IIH).” *At the Edge* (Editor-in-Chief, J. Lokash, English) is “a peer-reviewed, open access online journal that showcases the work of emerging scholars, particularly in the fields of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century literature and culture, or on Romanticism very broadly defined.”

Faculty and students have also experimented with open-access, student-generated publications such as *Mapping Politics*, “[a]n annual peer-reviewed journal produced by students in the *Political Science* department at Memorial University in St. John's, Newfoundland.”, and *Postscript*, “[a]n interdisciplinary journal published through the Department of English Language and Literature at Memorial University.”

The *Maritime History Archives* publishes valuable and highly desirable historical and genealogical information, in the form of fully-searchable databases of *Births, Deaths & Marriages in Newfoundland Newspapers*, and of *Ships and Seafarers of Atlantic Canada*, for example.

*Books@Memorial* showcases books published by Arts faculty members. It includes reviews, and links to the publisher’s website, where books can be purchased directly. *Books@Memorial* is complemented by *A Fine Crowd* (formerly, *Author! Author!*), an annual event that recognizes the achievements of authors who have published books in the past academic year.

Memorial University’s Faculty of Arts is home to a number of archival spaces, which contain unique collections reflecting the history, language, oral culture, folkways and popular culture of Newfoundland and Labrador. The Maritime History Archive (MHA) collection has proven valuable for research in many fields: for medical history, legal history, maritime history, labour and family history, documentary films, and web-based projects. From 2007-2012 the MHA
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attracted $671,692.55 in grants, $208,233.31 in other revenues, and $72,750.00 of in-kind funding. The English Language Research Centre (ELRC) has over 100,000 lexical files compiled for the Dictionary of Newfoundland English, as well as files and maps of local toponymy (place names), a collection of Newfoundland and Labrador proverbs and proverbial speech, a collection of family names (approximately a third of which appeared in Family Names of the Island of Newfoundland, 1976; corr. edition 1998), and unique and extensive audio recordings, including Harold Paddock’s (Linguistics, retired) lexical Atlas interview recordings (representing some 130 traditional speakers from both the island and Labrador. The MUN Foklore Archives (MUNFLA) is a remarkable resource and is based on the contributions of students, faculty and other researchers for 40 years. MUNFLA comprises extensive collections of Newfoundland and Labrador folksongs and music (See MacEdward Leach and the Songs of Atlantic Canada), folk narratives of many kinds, oral history, folk customs, beliefs and practices, childlore and descriptions of material culture, and Newfoundland popular culture.

Arts faculty, postdoctoral fellows, and graduate students are making a difference in Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada, and internationally, through engaging in cutting-edge research in the social sciences, sciences, and humanities.

3 What makes Arts different and special?

• Heterogeneity is a hallmark of Arts research.
  
  o For example, Arts research has been funded by SSHRC, NSERC, CIHR, and the Canada Council for the Arts.
  
  o The time scales for research outputs are variable
  
  o The criteria for assessing research quality are variable
  
  o In this sense, Arts research is essential to the mission of a comprehensive university

• Our overarching research themes include the meaning and construction of place, as it relates to the individual and society, as well as heritage and otherness.

• We view teaching, research, and service as a holistic enterprise. For this reason, we have also discussed in this report the aspects of teaching and service that could also be considered with an assessment of research, scholarship, and creative activity.

• We teach writing and literacy.

• We teach people how to think creativity, and with imagination.
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• We do research for and with communities. We work with them and develop long term relationships with the constituents. We respond to their needs and partner with them in research that is useful to them on many levels.

• We are knowledge mobilization experts. For example, with research-creation, we are able to ask uncomfortable questions, and convey messages that cannot be otherwise stated.

4 The Faculty of Arts values

• Diversity; Arts recognizes the value of a comprehensive university.

• Academic freedom and non-directed research.

• Both individual and collaborative research.

• Time to do research; time spent in research.

• The creative process; creative activity; non-formulaic thinking that fosters creativity.

• Public and community engagement; participatory forms of research with communities; giving communities or individuals a voice; community-informed research design; a strong local connection. Research and engagement are linked practices.

• Posterity; (translation work, archives, and long-term research programs are particularly relevant).

• Integrity; a lifetime of commitment to core values.

• Beauty (which is difficult to measure but everybody recognizes it).
  
  o We contribute clarity and beauty and hopefully cultivate in our students and others an appreciation of these things. C. Wright Mills and Peter Berger talk about such matters.

  o We value beautiful academic writing (as opposed to joyless prose).

• Global citizenship; cultivation of a global intellect; promotion and cultivation of cultural literacy and skill; preservation and promotion or championing of our cultures' social, artistic values.

• Teaching and learning; for some Arts departments in particular, the scholarship of teaching and learning is a primary focus. For all Arts departments, teaching and research are linked practices.
5 Methods of assessment

• Assessment should be holistic. Faculty members provided four different interpretations of holistic assessment:
  o Holistic assessment means the assessment of the department or faculty as a whole.
  o Holistic assessment means assessing individual research performance over the course of the entire career, not annually. Note that Article 12.13 (b) of the CA includes the statement that “Promotion recommendations and decisions shall be based on the entire career but the candidate shall demonstrate an appropriate record of academic performance since the most recent promotion decision in the body of work constituting research, scholarship or creative and professional activities.” The assessment necessary for such recommendations and decisions should recognize the impact of mitigating factors (parental leave, life events) if it is to be truly holistic.
  o Holistic assessment means the assessment of research, scholarship, and creative practice; in addition, where relevant, the quality of teaching and service activities related to research should be assessed.
  o Holistic assessment includes both quantitative and qualitative measures, with quality carrying the greater weight. Note that in the CA 12.13(b): The quality and originality of both published and unpublished work shall be assessed.

• Contextualization is paramount for assessing the quality of research, scholarship, and creative practice. Quantitative indicators are a necessary, but not sufficient measure of research quality. A narrative may be more appropriate than performance indicators for capturing intangible measures of success.

• Contextualization involves the following example considerations:
  o Any list of indicators should be nuanced and discipline-informed, acknowledging differences between departments and disciplinary cultures. In some disciplines, books are valued more than articles; in other disciplines, refereed articles count more; in some disciplines, partnerships are highly valued; yet other departments value a ‘mixed media’ form of assessment that would include citation indices, impact factors and lists of top disciplinary venues for research.
  o An example of contextualization is explaining the quality of the journal (for example, that it is actually one of the top journals in that field).
  o An example of contextualization is explaining why performances, plays, film productions, website development, etc. are valuable contributions.
An example of contextualization is explaining whether monographs or multi-authored publications are the norm within the discipline.

- Peer-review is integral to assessing the quality of research, scholarship, and creative practice. Existing methods of peer-review include:
  - The process for the assessment of individuals’ research, scholarship, and creative practice is governed by the Collective Agreement between Memorial University and MUNFA.
  - The Academic Program Review (APR). APRs involve a great deal of contextualization for research at the level of a unit or discipline. They bring in outside experts who have a sense of the discipline nationally and internationally to provide an accurate overview of the department’s performance.
  - Peer-review of grant applications, etc.

- A narrative process would best reflect our Faculty’s emphasis on a holistic and collegial process of contextualizing research success. Our goal should be to use a process of collegial consultation about research success at the unit level to produce evidence of research success that would be reported on a faculty-level aggregate basis.

- Quantitative indicators cannot used out of context.
  - Quantitative indicators—for example, the number of journal articles produced—are not standardized measures, and say little about the quality and impact of Arts research. Some articles require a huge investment in time and research; others result from shorter-term research processes. In some disciplines, two years between submission and publication is not unusual; in other disciplines, the time-frame is much shorter.
  - Similarly, quantitative indicators such as the amount of external grant funding need to be contextualized. In some disciplines, it is the norm to conduct high-quality research without research funding; in other disciplines, external funding is essential to the research enterprise.
  - See Appendix A (§7) for an example of the lack of correlation in the social sciences and humanities between qualitative measures (such as international reputation) and quantitative indicators (such as bibliometrics).

6 Potential elements of assessment

6.1 Overview

- Elements of assessment fall under two general categories of (a) research, scholarship,
creative practice, and engagement; (b) teaching and service work relevant to research.

- With respect to research, scholarship, and creative practice, the criteria for promotion in the MUNFA CA, 12.13 (b) is relevant. The criteria are listed in the following section.
- With respect to engagement, the Strategic Research Plan, Teaching and Learning Framework, and Engagement frameworks reinforce the value of community-engaged and community-engage research activities, which should be included in holistic assessments of the quality of research, scholarship, and creative practice. Criteria are listed in the following section.
- With respect to teaching related to research, section §3.2 of the CAUT teaching dossier (http://www.caut.ca/uploads/teaching_dossier_en.pdf) lists possible items for inclusion in a teaching dossier. Some of the items, listed in the next section, are the product of research.
- With respect to service work related to research, the criteria for promotion in the MUNFA CA, 12.13 (c) is relevant. The criteria are listed in the following section.

The Strategic Research Plan’s guiding principles value non-directed research: (a) Valuing and supporting the freedom of researchers to pursue research excellence that is based on their individual and collective intelligence, curiosity, ingenuity and creativity; (b) Valuing and supporting all aspects of research including scholarship and creative activities, as well as the translation of knowledge into products, practices and policies, and other forms of community engagement; (c) Valuing and supporting Memorial’s special obligation to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador

- The Teaching and Learning Framework’s vision for Teaching and Learning includes a university curriculum that is “…shaped and continually renewed by the results of research inquiry and the experience and perspectives of educators and students…”
- The vision of the Engagement Framework is “… to be a world leader as an engaged public university, through our special obligation to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.” The Engagement Framework discusses research-related goals, including “developing policies and programs that value and support effective public engagement…”, and knowledge mobilization.

The following incomplete list of potential elements of assessment were either suggested in consultative meetings, or were compiled from the Collective Agreement, the Academic Program Review (APR) CV template, and the CAUT Teaching Dossier. (The sources are listed below; where a source is not indicated, the element of assessment was suggested in the consultative meetings.) This list could inform a holistic assessment of the quality of research, scholarship, creative practice, and engagement, provided that the principles of assessment, discussed above, are respected.
6.2 Research, scholarship, and creative activity — potential elements of assessment

• Note that monographs and journal articles are important means of assessing research output success across a range of disciplines; many disciplines regard refereed journal articles as the key indicator of success.

• books (print, on-line, audio); (CA 12.13b)

• monographs; (CA 12.13b)
  • contributions to edited books; (CA 12.13b)
    o Eg. book cover commentaries (on collections of poems)
    o Introductions to books, chapters in books; (APR CV)
    o Publications in significant anthologies
  • papers; (CA 12.13b)
    o Articles (Indicate whether a journal is refereed or establish two sub-lists: refereed and non-refereed); (APR CV).
    o Review Articles or Essays; (APR CV)
    o Publications in literary journals (print and on-line)
  • Works in Press: (name of press or journal, number of manuscript pages, anticipated schedule; include relevant correspondence in dossier if available) ; (APR CV)
  • Works submitted but not yet accepted or works designated ‘revise and resubmit’; (APR CV)
  • Works in Progress; (APR CV)
  • Scholarly presentations delivered at professional meetings; (CA 12.13b)
    o Scholarly Lectures and Other Professional Presentations; invited and non-invited; (APR CV)
    o Abstracts; (APR CV)
  • Funding
    o Note that the Faculty of Arts needs to discuss a means for assessing the importance of external funding.
    o Grant applications submitted (successful, ‘recommended but not funded’, and failed applications)
    o Success in grant competitions; (CA 12.13b)
Funding, although the degree to which research funding is useful or necessary differs from department to department, colleague to colleague, and project to project.

External grant applications are an indirect reflection of performance through peer review of one's research.

If a grant application is successful, peer-reviewers say, “we believe you; you told a good story; we believe you can be successful and/or were successful.” Grant evaluation committees are set up so that applications can be compared by people who don’t know the discipline. These committees use a mix of quantitative measures (articles, etc.) and qualitative measures (‘most significant career contributions’, etc.).

Status as principal investigator, co-investigator, member of team; (APR CV)
  o Grants for student assistance (e.g. MUCEP, GRADSWEP, SCP, SWASP, NSTP); (APR CV)

- citation indices, as well as WoS and Google lists of top journals, represent useful means for measuring research success
  - participation in panels; (CA 12.13b)
    o Eg. participation in panel discussions and other such forums on poetry
  - unpublished research; (CA 12.13b)
  - Technical Reports; (APR CV)
  - Multimedia (CD, web), booklets; (APR CV)
  - Editorial and refereeing duties; (CA 12.13b); note that editing a book is similar to editing a journal in that they are both forms of intellectual engagement
    o Eg. being a peer-reviewer; reviewing manuscripts and books
  - Creative works and performances; (CA 12.13b)
    o Concerts, Performances, Exhibitions, Commissions and creative works completed and in progress; (APR CV)
    o Poetry readings in literary series, at literary festivals, at universities
  - Scholarship evidenced by the candidate's depth and breadth of knowledge and general contributions to the research life and creative milieu of the University; (CA 12.13b)
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- Eg. interviews in literary journals
- Consulting; (APR CV)

- Long-term impacts need to be measured. Also need to recognize the time span needed to mature long-term research.

- Awards, Honours, Professional Recognition, fellowships, medals; (APR CV)
  - Fellowships received as a faculty member (but not ones for graduate study), etc.; (APR CV)
  - Literary awards; nominations for literary awards

6.3 Engagement and capacity-building—potential elements of assessment

- Note that engagement is not currently valued or acknowledged as a scholarly activity in the Collective Agreement, and in other relevant structures at MUN.
- Publications that are valuable to the communities, but may not be recognized academically because they are not published by a university press.
- Sustained community trust and support, reflected in returning to do further research with the same community.
- Capacity building is of significant value. We help prepare grant applications for community organizations, which is an enormous amount of work that doesn’t show up on our CV, but is highly valuable.
- Community impact and opinion; e.g., tracking the numbers of people who visit archeological sites, and the experiences they have there. There is a huge economic and social benefit, and educational aspect of disseminating this information to thousands of people in the province. These are important measures of research excellence. The qualitative piece always boils down to capturing change: what changes, or potential changes, were a result of this project.
- In-kind contributions made by communities to faculty research.

6.4 Teaching—potential elements of assessment

- Supervision of Honour’s, Master’s or Ph.D. theses; (CAUT teaching dossier, §3.2)
- In Arts, the relationship of grad student research to faculty research is often indirect. Supervising PhD and Masters students in Arts is different, because you don’t get the pay-off in terms of publications. In Science, grad students benefit the PI’s CV, whereas for us it’s time away from our work. Graduate students do not benefit the PI’s research portfolio directly.
- Research seminars, course or curriculum development; course materials prepared for students; (CAUT teaching dossier, §3.2)
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- Research on instructional innovations attempted and evaluation of their effectiveness; Conducting research on one’s own teaching or course; (CAUT teaching dossier, §3.2)
- Service in an association or society concerned with the improvement of teaching and learning.; (CAUT teaching dossier, §3.2)
- Preparing a textbook or other instructional materials such as on-line ‘courseware’. ; (CAUT teaching dossier, §3.2)
- The presence of one’s research and creative work in university courses and in schools
- Editing or contributing to a professional journal on teaching one’s subject; (CAUT teaching dossier, §3.2)
- Invitations to contribute to the teaching literature; (CAUT teaching dossier, §3.2)
- Other kinds of invitations based on one’s reputation as a teacher, such as a media interview on a successful teaching innovation; (CAUT teaching dossier, §3.2)

6.5 Service— potential elements of assessment

- The following list includes service activities directly related to research, and service activities that reduce one’s ability to conduct research. The latter are relevant for the holistic assessment of an individual’s research career.
- Service in professional organizations and associations, learned societies, and disciplinary associations, for example, through holding office on executive boards and committees; (CA 12.13 c)
  - Being a member of an editorial board.
- Community service where the individual has made a contribution by virtue of special academic competence; (CA 12.13 c)
  - In-kind contributions that faculty members make to communities
  - Community Service and Outreach e.g., activities in support of, or promotion of, university/community relations – public lectures, boards of community organizations, videos, booklets, media interviews, exhibits, volunteer consulting; (APR CV)
- Adjudication of awards; being asked to adjudicate awards.
- Serving on a committee that ranks grant applications, etc.
- Internal and external activities related to the functioning of the University; (CA 12.13 c)
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- Administrative Responsibilities e.g. Program Chair/Coordinator, Department Head, etc.; (APR CV)

- Participating in University, Faculty, and Departmental Committees; (CA 12.13 c)
  - University Service: Separate into departmental, program or university committees and other university service and governance, including advising, recruiting, noting any delegated administrative responsibilities, etc.; (APR CV)

- General administrative duties; (CA 12.13 c)
  - Organizing or hosting conferences, departmental speaker series, talks

7 Recommendations for implementation

The Faculty of Arts is in the process of developing a Success Plan (Strategic Plan) that will encompass teaching, research, and engagement. For this reason, the Faculty is not yet ready to recommend a procedure for gauging research success in the Faculty of Arts. The latter will be developed through an additional process of collegial consultation.
8 Appendix A. International reputation and bibliometrics

“The [following] figure shows that for the natural sciences, engineering, and health sciences (5.4a), the percentage of survey respondents identifying Canada in the top five in the world is highly correlated with Canada’s share of the world’s top one per cent of papers in the field (as listed in Table 4.4). In contrast, for fields in the humanities, arts, and social sciences18 (5.4b), the lack of correlation between the survey results and the field’s share of top-cited papers suggests that international reputation in these fields is largely dependent on factors other than bibliometrics such as books and book chapters...” [Council of Canadian Academies 2012:72]

Figure 5.4

The Relationship between Bibliometrics and Reputation

This figure shows the relationship between Canada’s share of the top one per cent most highly cited papers and the percentage of top-cited researchers naming Canada in the top five in each field in a) the natural and health sciences and engineering, and b) the humanities, arts, and social sciences. Each data point represents a single field.

Source: The share of world papers was calculated by Science-Metrix using the Scopus database (Elsevier)

[Council of Canadian Academies 2012:73]
9 Appendix B: Capturing Research Success — Draft notes from Consultative Meetings

(See attached.)
9 Introduction

Memorial University is a diverse community of people who engage in many forms of research, scholarship, and creative activity. In addition, Memorial recognizes its special obligation to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador; within this context, research often entails engagement.

What qualities of research do we value? How do we know we are successful? As a community of arts, humanities and social sciences researchers, it is our responsibility to show how we achieve excellence in what we value.

It is clear that, with the diversity of research outputs — including scholarship and creative practice — for the arts, humanities and social sciences, quantitative measures are insufficient indicators of research quality.

A consortium of units at Memorial including Arts, Education, Social Work, Music and the School of Business have undertaken a process of research and consultation to discover if, when, and how we might best account for and represent our research successes.

Drawing on the experience of other institutions and on existing literature, and through consultation with Memorial faculty in the arts, humanities and social sciences, our goal is to find ways to communicate our success and excellence in research, scholarship, and creative activity.

To accomplish our goal, we will engage in a consultation process. The questions for consultation are as follows:

9.1 Questions for consultation

1. What do we value in our research, scholarship, and creative practice?
2. What research, scholarship, and creative practice in our Academic Unit is special? How is it special? Why is it special?
3. What are the best ways to describe and assess our research, scholarship, and creative practice?
4. How can we most effectively gauge our success?

9.2 Process

The following notes were compiled and summarized by Kelley Bromley-Brits, with further modifications by Carrie Dyck. The notes are based on consultation meetings with groups of departments, departmental submissions, and individual submissions, as detailed below.

1. Consultations with departments
   • November 13, 2012 Classics, Philosophy, and Religious Studies
   • November 20, 2012 Archaeology, Geography, and Linguistics
   • December 13, 2012 Gender Studies, Humanities, and History
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- January 8, 2013 English Language and Literature, French and Spanish, German and Russian, Folklore
- January 15, 2013 Anthropology, Economics, Political Science, and Sociology
- March 4, 2013 English Language and Literature, French and Spanish, German and Russian

2. Departmental Submissions
- German and Russian
- Political Science
- History


9.3  November 13, 2012 Capturing Research Success (Classics, Philosophy, and Religious Studies)

9.3.1  Arts research is largely internally-funded
- External funding dollars do not reflect research performance
- Our main research costs involve TIME.
- A percentage of our salary is for research

9.3.2  Valuation
- Nussbaum “Not for Profit” talked about how money-in cannot be balanced with the VALUE you get out; if you think in terms of dollars you won’t do what the humanities do; this is beyond the numbers. Students may give testimonials 10 years later, saying how we changed their lives. We contribute to society in intangible ways that are difficult to quantify.
- In terms of indicators, Arts is diverse; therefore, any list of indicators will marginalize some; this is the wrong game to play. Any one of the national benchmarks marginalizes Arts research.

9.3.3  Quantification
- The push towards quantification may be inevitable; RPI’s may be used to justify budget cuts. This is all the more reason for us to explain why RPI’s don’t capture what they mean to.
- They have all these figures already, so it’s good for us to say why quantification isn’t appropriate; express our dissenting opinion.
- It may be appropriate to discuss indicators that are relevant for Arts (e.g., books, book reviews, etc.)

9.3.4  Teaching
- The interconnection between teaching and research makes Arts research special.
- In Arts, our research informs our teaching and our teaching informs our research.
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- Arts teaching heavily addresses controversies around the material presented, and fosters critical thinking. Graduates from Arts, regardless of the field, are sought-after because of the skills they develop.
- The Arts degree works because the people in the faculty are passionate about their subjects; the passion infuses the quality of the learning experience; what we research is what we’re most engaged with and we bring that into our teaching, and infuse this enthusiasm into the topic we’re teaching; we recognize and communicate the complexity of that aspect of our teaching.
- The dichotomy is between writing and research/teaching. (We can research and teach at the same time, but we can’t write while we teach). The problem is no time for WRITING. Teaching load needs to be reduced to have a productive department if the number of publications can be used as an indicator.

9.3.5 What makes Arts stand out

- In Arts we teach writing, imagination. Literacy of the community is something a vibrant Arts faculty contributes to, not something that can be quantified; but if it’s not there you’ll realize it. Business and industry will get a lot more out of people who can supervise, think critically, etc. Well educated people who can think clearly and write well are desirable to businesses as well. Literacy can’t be quantified, but it results in valuable non-formulaic thinking.
- Teach people how to THINK and foster creativity.
- Arts views teaching, research, and service as a holistic enterprise. Research enriches teaching and vice versa; similarly, service enriches research, and vice versa. We can’t do all three aspects at the same time, but the holistic nature makes Arts special.
- We are the rainforest of Academia (!)
  - Arts research is difficult to market, and it is currently not well-valued.
  - But it’s essential.

9.3.6 Indicators

- Research virtues versus market values
  - Research Performance Indicators value money alone; should this be our only societal values?
  - The South African GDP was stellar under apartheid; but consider the values that underlay that performance. Should purely market-driven valuation be the main consideration of worth?
- Any esoteric research is, in a sense, unmarketable. It is difficult for the Gazette to market the fact that, for example, someone published about modal operators in a journal with a 2% acceptance rate.
- Our service role is a large component of our time commitment, and is a large contribution to other people’s research. Part of why we have these roles is because of our success and reputation in research. Examples include conducting peer-review, being on the editorial board
of journals, reviewing manuscripts for publications, being an adjudicator for grant competitions, doing book reviews. We’re asked to contribute because of our reputations. Other people’s service facilitates our research and our publications, and vice versa. The fact that they keep asking us to do this work demonstrates our presence in the scholarly community, and the quality of our service work.

- Books should be on the list of performance indicators.
- The RPI of the number of PhD and Masters working in NL privileges Science and professional schools.
  - However, student success in the job marked could be a useful indicator. 95% of Arts graduates get a full-time job in 2-years; promoting or championing ourselves in this light is beneficial.

### 9.3.7 Recommendations for the reporting process

- Mis-valuing Arts research could lead to less support for Arts; this could lead to the average NL student being unable to learn Arts research skills (literacy, creativity, imagination, alternative world views).
- Endeavour to get advice from the silent - those who value teaching over research, etc. Otherwise, your sample will be skewed.
- Convey this message: can NL afford to have an Oil and Gas university when we’re the only university we have in town? It is imperative that MUN remain a truly comprehensive university, with healthy faculties for Arts, Humanities, Science, etc.
- Educate the upper administration on the worth of Arts research, so that they (and we) CHAMPION Arts research.
- Focus on what makes Arts distinctive; (not necessarily employability, but for self-fulfillment, development, etc.); cultivation of comprehensive, holistic intellectual ability - a global intellect; promotion and cultivation of cultural literacy and skill, preservation and promotion or championing of our cultures' social, artistic values.

### 9.4 November 20, 2012 Capturing Research Success (Archaeology, Geography, Linguistics)

#### 9.4.1 Recommendations for process of reporting

- **If we don’t figure out a way to tell our story, others will come up with a way to tell it using their value system instead of ours;** if we are judged by the value system of others, the only response we can give is to say that we are “misunderstood.” We need to be able to gauge success, and we recognize that how we do so will be different for different areas.

- **We must include everyone when we craft the story**
  - The Faculty of Arts has 16 departments and each one has a different mandate.
- Have some people who produce typical academic output at a high level, and other people who have a mix with community engagement, but the community engagement is what helped them to get the big research grant.
- What would greater success for these individuals look like in the future? More publications for the one colleague, and more engagement for the other. Different people measure success in different ways.
- Important for the report from this process to explicitly reflect the idea of the disciplinary diversity in the understanding of success. Not that arts and humanities are special in themselves, but that there is a variation in how each discipline understands success.
  - Any time we tell a story it’s important to have an area carved out for the pure scholars and the ones whose focus doesn’t lend itself to collaborative research or even to funding. How can we tell a story about these people except that their output is recognized by their peers?
- **We must learn from what has happened in other countries when there is a shift to the quantification of success.**
  - MUN hasn’t gone through the matrix processes that have happened in UK and South Africa that have been very damaging to research environments, both in the social sciences and humanities, and other areas. We don’t want to find ourselves in a similar situation without having some of our own terms. In South Africa your CV is a technical document with listings of impact factors, etc. If we want to have an engagement policy we really believe in, we have to take the opportunity to describe things that haven’t described before.
  - The purpose of this process is different than that seen in South Africa and the UK. We need to convince our government that greater investment in university research is essential.
  - We need to be able to tell a story that is specific. In the UK, they used Resource Allocation Evaluation to assess people in things unrelated to resources. We are not against being assessed, we just need to be assessed in different, appropriate ways.
- **Our story must be ready before there is a deadline.** There is no timeline driving this process, but by the time someone asks us to explain why MUN ranks the way it does, they’ll want the documentation of our values and successes immediately, and will give an unreasonable amount of time to complete it. We don’t want to scramble, so it’s important to make this document now.
- **We need a tailored approach; we could look to grant review processes for guidance.** If a grant application is successful, peer-review says, “we believe you; you told a good story; we believe you can be successful and/or were successful.” Are there things we can take from how grant applications are judged to judge our own success?
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- Grant evaluation committees are set up so that applications can be compared by people who don’t know the discipline, and there is a mix of qualitative and quantitative measures.
- The problem is you still have to set up a system to compare it with, for example, studying the ancient past may not be as attractive as studying something currently. If you look at successful applicants, you can see that there is clearly a theme they are looking for, and that they are looking for modern or urban research projects. What if you have something that doesn’t seem as relevant? Classists are not generally viewed well by SSHRC; how will applying SSHRC principles benefit everybody?
- Danger of using grants as a basis is that you can risk neglecting the incomprehensible people, who may well have excellent, world-wide reputations, but who cannot explain very articulately what they are doing.
- If you’re setting something up like this you have to set up the criteria. SSHRC asks you to talk about relevance and knowledge mobilization, mentoring, things that are valued across disciplines.

How are external reviews and grant applications structured so that external people can conceptualize and judge success in all cases?

- The applicant has to explain a lot and tell the story.
- Reviewers receive a lot of instructions on what the agency values and what they should look for in the application. For example:
  - Contextualization
  - List of values → could be a problem because we’re so diverse
    - Examples: Challenge, feasibility, and capability are what SSHRC value; NSF values transformative research
  - Standardization: For example, standard CV. But this excludes many contributions because they don’t fit the standard mold. If these are added, there’s a less objective process for evaluating the applications.
  - You have an opportunity to address different issues that are important to the agency.

- The promotion and tenure process could be a guide.

- Another complimentary model is APR (departmental review) which involves a great deal of contextualization and bringing in outside eyes that have a sense of the discipline nationally and internationally. So we have models that do this. Is it possible/desirable to aggregate APR from across the Arts and use that? As a process, they have quite a lot of contextualization.
  - Different departments may perform APRs at different levels.
  - Sometimes our programs are viewed as teaching programs, so APR isn’t departmental review, but viewed narrowly as academic programming, which is only a piece of what we do.
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- Most research-focused units tend to have their academic programming similar to what they do, but others don’t.
- It’s a free-form, self-study so you can finesse the questions.
- These things only happen every 6 – 10 years. We don’t get an institutional snapshot at any particular time.

- **The collective agreement defines scholarship.** There is a list of scholarship in the collective agreement.

- Academic program reviews, external P&T assessments... the types of questions that are asked in these external reviews, and the instructions they provide, can illuminate this process.

**9.4.2 What makes Arts at MUN different**

- **We do research for communities.** We work with them and develop long term relationships with the constituents. We respond to their needs and partner with them in research that is useful to them on many levels.

- **We are knowledge mobilization experts.** We are the place that people look to see how this is done: general publishing, film making, museums, training within communities, capacity development in communities, etc. These things are low on the CV, but maintain the relationship with the community and help us to obtain grants.
  - Interdisciplinary collaboration creates a type of tool that can give you outputs that you couldn’t have achieved otherwise. For example, a psychology paper could use linguistic concepts to control for many different factors when they pose people questions. This is unique to arts, humanities, and social sciences (maybe not unique) but recognize that it’s needed.
  - We recognize that it’s needed but few people are doing it it seems. For example, in archeology you see a formation and want to know if it’s natural or cultural... if you don’t know what other people are up to, how would you know who to ask within your own university?

- **We are highly collaborative.** There is a lot of academic freedom in Arts: Collaboration, collegiality, the ability to ask questions that are not necessarily comfortable for everyone they are posed to or for everyone involved.
  - Would like to see why this is important communicated in the report. Narrating these points to the tri-councils will be easy, but we will need to find ways to craft the narrative for multiple different audiences.
  - Interdisciplinary work is huge in archeology, and necessary to interpret findings; that’s what we’re all about.

- **We may not fund graduate students through grants.** Funding graduate students through SSHRC grants happens much less frequently than in Science. The low funding we can offer means there are fewer students, so our trainee output is not comparable to the Sciences.

- **We have a research focus that is specific to our institution.**
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  o Comparing departments across the country has to be tempered by the fact that just because you’re called the same discipline, doesn’t mean you’re doing the same research. Linguistics at UofT is intensely theoretical, here there is a lot more community engagement and research into the languages in the province, while UofA has a strong experimental bent. Even limiting ourselves to these 3, you can’t count dollars or normal academic output; there’s not much you can compare except that they are all linguistic departments. But we can contextualize this.

  o We value local research. We use provincial issues to develop research which is nationally and internationally significant. Our local research shines a light on issues that are important in this country. Our special significance to the province allows us to approach research differently but with the same goals and results – national and international recognition.

  o Would like to have a series of qualitative ways to measure our research success, and most, but not all, of these will be linked to this province.

  • Our research is not as expensive, and doesn’t require as much grant funding.

  o A few years ago there was a push to get more applicants to apply SSHRC. Our success rate has gotten better and better, but our number of applications is not large, so we’re producing few applications but very directed ones. This is better than getting people to engage in a process they don’t need to go through.

9.4.3 Indicators

  • Community support: The communities we do research with keep allowing us back; if the work wasn’t valued, or if they did not appreciate our presence, we wouldn’t have such strong relationships with them.

  o The community trusts us; can we put numbers to this? For example, we have been doing research there for so many years... but the difference is in being tolerated vs. liked. Comes from interactions with the communities that others may not have.

  • Awards: Some publications aren’t disseminated peer-reviewed publishers; they are mostly for the use of the people, who publish them themselves. They are valuable to the communities, but may not be recognized academically because they are not published by a university press. It shouldn’t matter how it is published; the data is out there and available. The value could potentially be recognized by an Award, rather than by the publisher.

  • Funding: The combination of theoretical and applied disciplines works well when applying for funding; collaboration opens access to funds which would normally not be available (for example, NSERC).

  o Non-traditional funding is also important, and often critical to get projects done. There is a different process to get it because different standards are applied, but it demonstrates the value of our work.

  o We help prepare grant applications for community organizations, which is an enormous amount of work that doesn’t show up on our CV, but is highly valuable.
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- A lot of faculty don’t need funding to do what they do. For example, some don’t need to apply to spend all of their time in the Center for NL Studies. However, their output is measureable (journals, books, dissemination).

- **Outputs**: Funding is an input. In some case funding is a reflection of previous research, and larger grants don’t necessarily relate to value of the research; peer-review of past success and current trends are also considered. Community engagement, workshops, and dissemination of past research are outputs that can define our research activity.
  - Some of our outputs may be different in the Arts vs. the Sciences: for example, researchers in Arts provide mentorship to graduate students, but the students may not be working directly on the topic of the supervisor, so number of graduate students graduating may mean something different.
  - Some of our outputs take time to mature: There may be local outputs from theoretical work that was performed 20 years ago, which could later become very important and prominent. For example, Prof X’s work on the Y turned out to be very important in a court case. There are several other examples where at the time people may not have thought it was going to be that influential, but it had long-term impact and value.

- **Peer-review**: There are already peer-review methods in place to assess success (for example, promotion and tenure assessments). In these cases, success is often accompanied by explanations, such as:
  - Explaining the quality of the journal (for example, that it is actually one of the top journals in that field)
  - Explaining why performances, plays, film productions, website development, etc. are valuable contributions
  - Explaining whether monographs or multi-authored publications are the norm

- **Community Impact**: For example, people are tracking the numbers of people who visit archeological sites, and the experiences they have there. This is not showing up in tenure review or on CVs, but is important in the communities. There is a huge economic and social benefit, and educational aspect of disseminating this information to thousands of people in the province. These are important measures of research excellence.

9.5  December 13, 2012 Capturing Research Success (Gender Studies, Humanities, History)

9.5.1  What makes Arts at MUN different/special
- **Connection between Teaching and Research**
  - There is a very close relationship between what we do in the classroom and our research. Questions students ask us in the classroom go into our research, and we try to bring our research into the classroom as well.
  - Teaching is central to MUN. Elite universities (Toronto, Montreal, McGill, UBC, Manitoba, etc) all endorse a research separate from teaching model, which is very
much encouraged in their P&T model, and those that focus on teaching are penalized at those institutions.

- Our research is fundamentally affected by our teaching. I have taught every course except 1 in the undergrad curriculum and every single grad course (11 different courses in 4 years). The benefit is that I get an overview I can use in my research, but it can take longer to produce this material, and affects how we measure research productivity.

**The concept of place and otherness**

- In the 50s there was a drive for the university to educate rural Newfoundlanders and modernize society, and to leverage our location in building a research profile. Interdisciplinary cooperation was a hallmark of the early years, but it feels like this is less-so now.
- Our interest in place is unique, whatever you understand that place to be, the meaning and construction and place, and who you are. This is a theme in First Nations too; the recognition of the value of place.
- We are regarded as the world leaders in maritime sea-farers records.
- A major theme in social science research is the concept of understanding “otherness”: recognition of the differentness of a place from other places. This is here.
- Important to look at the value of the project within a particular community. In smaller communities the projects have a much bigger impact and importance, but it is an uphill battle to convince a committee that these smaller projects are more important than larger ones.

**One-on-one engagement**

- There is an expectation of engagement with people on an individual level, as opposed to the class of 400 students at UofT. Here I spend a lot of time engaging with students; this means less time for publications, but a higher quality environment for students (travel abroad, success in obtaining good graduate student positions).

**We are both interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary**

- We can do multidisciplinary work in groups, but we also have individual researchers who are interdisciplinary within their own practice; we are more diverse than in other parts of the university. At SFU the Dean of Arts said that they are the only part of the university that can apply to all 3 granting agencies, and that is worth recognizing.

**9.5.2 What we value**

**Academic freedom**

- Other units feel directed research is more important, but we value non-directed research, the academic freedom and ability to explore ideas. Measuring this can sometimes put limits on academic freedom, and we err on the side of the freedom.
- We have 10 strategic areas, but if we make the mistake of focusing too much on these in the short term, we can inhibit our creativity in the long term.

**Community engagement**
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- What we value in research and creative practice is the way that we can bring it to the community that we live in.
- Important for us to feel as if we are part of this community, our community, and I don’t want to feel that I work in an institution that is removed from this place
  - How can we effectively gauge this kind of involvement and connection with the community?

- **Prosperity (in the humanities)**
  - It feels like we’re swimming uphill; we’re in a culture which thinks in very short time frames. Social scientists are very present in their terms, whereas the humanities speak to prosperity. When we have a culture (western world) which values posterity very little, where history is valued for its entertainment content, and things that are problem orientated and present-ist are automatically important, we’re swimming against the tide. Any statement of our self-worth and evaluation of ourselves has to take note of a work in translation, for example, which has real value in prosperity, but you’ve already lost if you’re going to assign a monetary value.
  - To put out a new edition of a major work, there are a lot of things you have to assemble which may not have been assessed in 100 years. Putting out a new, scholarly annotated edition can be an entire career. It’s a different way of thinking and being.

9.5.3 **What we can use as a guide**

- **Promotion and tenure process?**
  - P&T committee guided by language in collective agreement which is flexible for measuring all sorts of things, so we should be able to incorporate our values.

- **Grant applications**
  - In grant applications we talk about the type of research we do and how it’s different at Memorial or enhanced at Memorial
  - Could have close look at current regime in Britain and adopt the opposite.

9.5.4 **Indicators**

- The true value of Arts research is the output. Eg. The book that helps people understand their place in the world and the interaction between gender and class and how we operate. Our outputs deal with questions which are central to so many of us; how do we understand the stories that are created and are created for us?

- **Not impact factors**
  - Example: The Journal of Newfoundland Studies has an impact factor of basically 0. If the impact and international renown is the basis of what journal you’ll publish in, that journal would be lost. A famous article about the Mummers was submitted to a local journal of historical review but was rejected, then later submitted to a premier journal which ran it immediately and made the author’s career. Wasn’t good enough for the
local journal (it had the wrong perspective), but got the equivalent of Nature for Arts. So impact factors are not reliable indicators of quality.

9.5.5 Comments on this process

- Seek departmental input
  o Different units have different ideas for what would be appropriate to measure for their disciplines, so getting different units together is not the way to establish what is important at the Faculty level. Better to ask units to take up this issue and establish what is important, and have the faculty consider that.

- Ensure proper communication to the provincial government
  o No guarantee that the story we tell will change what people will do, but our biggest external group that we must make sure understands our story is our own provincial government. They need to understand parts of the institution that they may not be as interested in. This is where the story of how your discipline is set within this place has particular benefit. This may not affect SSHRC funding, but if what we value is reflected in our strategic plan for our institution, then they have to ignore it versus not be aware of it.

- Have senior admin involved the whole way through
  o The institution supports the research and the researcher asks for institutional support. Many of our past successes were a symbiotic relationship between the two and you can’t disentangle them. A lot of the victories were when senior admin were there the whole way with recognition and support, and if have too short a time window for assessment you just don’t see that.

- There are problems with the issues
  o One thing that is unique is our ability to problematize the issues. This is why we haven’t had any solid answers to the questions.
  o Problematization and reflexivity is important in society: our belief that there are no easy answers.

9.5.6 Changes which would improve research success

- Reducing the teaching load
  o We have a 2/3 teaching load, and for some of us that is 150 students a term, and we’re really tired.
  o A 4 rather than 5 teaching load is important if you want good success in research. This wouldn’t affect undergrad enrollment; you would just be moving people around seats in a slightly smaller course selection. Some people will think you get less out of us if we only have a 4 course load, but you would be getting MORE out of us.

- Providing additional support
  o For researchers outside the strategic areas
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- Only reason there is a strategic framework in 10 areas is that the university has to make it clear where it is going to throw its weight; this is important since major collaborative grants want to see an actual, measurable commitment of the university to the project. MUN wouldn’t say it won’t support an area, but makes it clear where the support is; however, the university still needs to encourage applications which don’t fit in these areas and to recognize the importance of the 4A status. The standards should be higher for people who do fit in those strategic areas and have access to more support.

  o Provincial funding agencies
    - Memorial should be recognized for its research and local flavor, and not thought of as a college-type, labour-market instrument. We still don’t have a provincial research fund like BC, AB, and other provinces in terms of matching support, etc.

  o Technical assistance
    - The idea that you have a cost-recovering system for a basic service (like technical support) negatively affects people in arts. We can’t access the research funds necessary to pay for what should be a service. The institutional mechanism for managing the resources that are here differentially impacts members at the university.

  o Marketing
    - When the DFO still had a large number of scientists, they didn’t have a single social scientist on board. They didn’t think that understanding the society of the fishermen was important, only the ecology of the fish. The most recent debate/discussion is the province’s poverty levels. The government has promised that poverty levels would be lowest in the country by next year (would be a miracle). This is clearly based on high level people having no idea about what research is going on in poverty in Arts and Social work. The research that we’re doing and the utility of it is invisible.
    - We have to make a bigger and better argument about our importance and what we can offer, but another component is the very strong attitude of the provincial and federal government of what constitutes “research”, which has a very science, engineering, and medicine focus. Everything else is not real, fluffy, not important, doesn’t count. In fact, most government decisions and day to day business isn’t in science and technology, it is in the social sciences and humanities. There’s a very significant disconnect.
    - There is such variety in Arts, and sometimes I feel the university doesn’t celebrate the variety. Also interested in appealing to the provincial government, but there’s so much they don’t hear about.
    - We tend to make fun of the people who call up CBC every time they discover something, but maybe this is something we should be doing more often.
9.5.7 Issues that negatively alter the perception of research success

- **Travel from Newfoundland is expensive**
  - More expensive travel impedes the development of our CV
  - On the mainland you could just drive to conferences to boost your academic record

- **Not all departments have doctoral programs**
  - Agencies like SSHRC value student training, but not always possible to train graduate students

- **The nature of the work**
  - Pieces of a letter in archeology which must be put together, vs. pulling a letter from the archive, vs. printing a letter.

- **Academic culture has changed**
  - When George Storey started the Newfoundland English Dictionary in 1956 he didn’t know it wouldn’t be published until 1982. A new person today would not be able to spend 25 years doing this, because their peers wouldn’t promote them from Assistant to Associate Professor, etc. The culture has changed.

- **Failure to look at the career as a whole**
  - People’s CVs have a rhythm, and short-term assessments don’t appreciate that. As they have children, age, other things in their lives, take on administrative burdens. There is a rhythm which must be acknowledged.
  - In history, you can write an article early in your career that makes you famous, even if you don’t do much beyond this. The SSHRC model of only looking at the last 6 years is from another culture. It’s not wrong, it’s just different. I suspect it’s a culture that favours the social sciences rather than the humanities. Some of us have been working on projects for 13 or 17 years; these things can take a very long time. This is respected among colleagues, but on normal performance indicators doesn’t look good (in this case, conferences would be the major contribution).

- **Failure to consider the life-stage of faculty**
  - A lot of junior scholars have babies, which interferes with their research and careers. Being pregnant and breast feeding has a significant impact of 2 years. Lack of available child care will fundamentally affect your research, and this is all part of this longer-term rhythm where you can penalize scholars depending on the life stage that they’re in. A longer rhythm would allow us to acknowledge some of these things, and recognize that not all projects fit neatly into life.

9.6 January 8, 2013 Capturing Research Success (English, French & Spanish, German & Russian, Folklore)

9.6.1 What we value

- **Community engagement**
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- For us, community engagement began with teaching rather than research, but it is connected. We started a program to get grad students out in the community and it has worked very well and we’re proud of it. Biology does a similar kind of thing in Bonne Bay. These activities are related to where we are, but are not often considered research. If we are going to redefine what “research” is we need to highlight these things.
- This is particularly true in creative writing, which is in the process of starting an MA program that will bolster that connection with this province.
- English: SPARKS literary festival doesn’t need or attract funding but has a profound impact on the reading and writing community.
- We talk about community engagement in terms of results, but a lot of the time engagement starts with interviewing people who don’t have a voice to begin with. Our research may be more transient, not necessarily researcher and subject. Participants are like co-researchers.
- Community engagement has many different segments within in, like community based participatory research, where the subject area comes out of the community and the researcher says, “Let me assist you to explore this topic.” Then there are other ways like sending a student out in the community. Bringing someone in to act as a co-investigator is also an important point.

* The importance of place
  - We don’t have much research funding but do quite a lot of research; it may not immediately lead to a publication (will later) but we may put together a local video. If we are involved in a special place it is more than getting grants.
  - A strong local connection is a strong selling point. I have colleagues involved in the creative writing scene, which has obvious local resonance and we will emphasize that aspect of our work, but it doesn’t mean that we fail to recognize the value of international subjects. NL identity is very fluid, and I suspect NL culture and identity is more cosmopolitan than the world that produced the NL dictionary of English.

* Heritage and prosperity
  - Governments change, but always in the past there was this sense that we didn’t have to argue that what we were doing would bring in X dollars or X jobs, or had to do with NL culture. We can’t put a dollar value on our research; it’s about people and self-image and their worth and culture. As the administration changes, it’s important to argue that our work doesn’t have to have a dollar value on it, what we do has to do with heritage recognition.

* Fostering global citizenship
  - Through teaching
    - It’s a challenge coming from Russian literature: Folklore is everywhere, English is everywhere, but Russian isn’t spoken near here. It’s the same in German;
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they don’t have a large heritage community. But we bring another portion to what we do. We teach language but also culture, film, communications, literature. We provide intercultural contact. Is this valuable in and of itself on the island? No, they’re not getting jobs here on the island, but it’s our responsibility to bring the outside in. Global citizenship. To bring that which is not here, here.

- Our department (Folklore) is recognized for community contributions about NL, but is our university supposed to be about teaching NL, or should it provide an international context? We don’t look only in NL; we’re pushing in other directions all the time.

  o **Through international travel experiences for students**
    - Our Harlow campus opens the world to NL students so that they come back and make this place a much better place. See this so many times at Harlow; passionate Newfoundlanders see the world and their horizons broaden. They don’t reject what is here, but come back enriched.
    - We have three field schools: Russian, German, Italian; a lot of students sign up for this so they can “travel the world”.

  o **Through creative practice**
    - “Research/scholarship” we think of as two sides of the same coin, but “Creative practice” we think of the music school, but it also works for English, German, French, Spanish, and Folklore, because we’re all there doing things publically, or training young people to appreciate their world in new cosmopolitan ways. I think this creative practice term may be a key into an area that values all of these aspects in the same way. We’re developing those children into good adults. Not that creative practice is only that but it is certainly a part of it. So what we value is how these things impact student global citizenship.

**Teaching**

- Russian and German provide the prestige desired by Joey Smallwood, because not that many places in Canada can offer these things, and that’s just teaching and not research. The prestige is the presence of it.
- My research goes into my teaching, my honours students work on what I work on, I feed them and they feed me.
- For departments that don’t have grad programs research isn’t as important; do we shoot ourselves in the foot if we say that what we value is teaching? There is heterogeneity in Arts departments, and for some teaching is a primary mandate. Is there room in a university that brings in money in other fields to carry along other departments?

**Experiential learning**
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- I benefit every year from student career development money (SWASP, MUCEP, etc.) and they ask us to identify the ways that the student has grown since they have started this job. At first I wasn’t into it, but now I sit down with students to go over this. Not exactly teaching, or research, or creative practice, but some of the things that go into it are there. One of the terms for this is the teaching-research nexus. It’s kind of the idea of our research informing our teaching and our teaching informing our research. It’s a thing in itself, not just where things meet.
- The Faculty of Arts is starting to recognize the benefit of experiential education. As more and more students feel pressure of student loans, experiential education gives them a skill they know how to use and apply in the real world.
- We’ve added a co-op program in Folklore and at the American Folklore Society meetings in the fall we saw that a lot of universities are moving in that direction, and they were asking us about how we were running it. Students do 2 work term placements, 2 reports, and 8 courses. Through the office of co-op organization they work with heritage organizations and government agencies. It’s been hugely successful, and we’re very pleased with it.

• We should value editor roles, but for some reason we don’t
  - Becoming the editor of a journal is very time-consuming, but you are not given credit for it. When you get tenure you can do it, because you have to spend tons of time and effort and it shows very little.

9.6.2 What makes Arts different / special

• Research is affordable
  - In some ways we are small scale, interview a few people, and our studies are much less expense, so some of it can be self-funded.
    - That said, Science and Arts pay the same price to go to conferences, etc., so there are certain costs regardless of discipline and we need to obtain resources through either internal or external competition.
  - The degree to which research funding is useful or necessary differs from department to department, colleague to colleague, and project to project. When we look at research applications for Folklore to look at Iranian women rug-making, they need money to get there. For history, they need time, energy, and the computer. When we talk about underfunding and underperformance, we have to keep that in mind. But in the absence of funding dollars, how do we gauge success?
    - Perhaps we are asking for less money because we are engaged in local work and don’t need it. It could be a good thing; a sign of the research that we can take on here.
  - We are told by the administration to do SSHRC applications and I applied 3 times with 4A status, but I don’t need a SSHRC for what I need to do. I would have been better off
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not using that time for the grant but to do my research. Different levels may not recognize this.

- Others had similar experiences.
- We are very generously reimbursed for our supervision, and because we have a large supervisory load and because research costs are not high, my supervisory activities support most of my research expenses.
- I stopped applying for SSHRC grants because I have lots of data and just need the time to look at it.

• **We have a fluid concept of value**
  - If we review a colleague that goes for quantity, we say, “Well done on quantity front!”; if they choose to go for quality we say, “Well done on quality front!”; we don’t have a standard that there is one way to do something; we think fluidity is a good thing.

• **Time scales are highly variable**
  - Is there more of a time commitment to the type of research outputs that we create? Hard to quantitate this in a fair way. Turnover for journals can be 2 years or 2 months, while for books there can be quite a difference. A book that’s the result of a thesis is a large time commitment, a dictionary can take 10 years, and many other books may not require the same research time commitment.

9.6.3 **Administrative recommendations**

• **Broaden the definition of research**
  - Talking about research performance indicators, but what does the term “research” cover? Maybe we need a VP Research, Scholarship and Creative activity, not just VP Research? If we try to measure this should be all three, but instead we’re trying to say how scholarship and creative activity is research. We need to convince across the board that these three are important (surely engineering has creative activity as well.)

• **Take teaching load into consideration when looking at grant success rate**
  - Look at the number of grants awarded relative to teaching load at different universities (teaching should include the number of students), and also look at supervisory load (example of teaching-research nexus). Talking about our supervisory loads may also be a way to look at success.

• **Continue to have higher administration talk with faculty**
  - I enjoy talking with colleagues, and never had the opportunity to talk to higher admin. Part of the problem with performance indicators was the sense that members of the senior administration were imposing this. The more of this kind of communication [this meeting] that we have the better, because we do understand that the senior admin face difficulties and have to face the budget and government, and it’s a shame that we exist in a state of mutual solitude.
9.6.4 Potential Indicators

- Community opinion
  - What the community thinks of us could be an indicator. Eg. I really like what that guy does with icebergs. But this leaves out entire fields of research (such as international), so I’m not saying to remove the other indicators, but maybe to add community opinion.

- Outputs specific to your discipline
  - Different departments have different standards and criteria: what some departments say is creative and great, another could say is all local and not refereed.
  - In Folklore books are valued more than articles, and other disciplines argue that refereed articles count more, and others partnerships. There are different departmental and disciplinary cultures, and this is respected.

- Long-term impacts
  - Good teaching is transformative; we cast our pebbles and sometimes students come back to you years later to tell you how much of an impact it had on them.
  - You send your book out there, but how do you know if it moves people? Is this something that we should/could measure? SSHRC has outputs/outcomes/impacts, impacts are long-term impacts on the community, and SSHRC is interested in measuring these long after the grant is over. How do they measure this?
    - For example, there could be a change in policy that occurred as a result of the research, or a transformation in a community as a result of research done 5 years before. Would be interested to look for these ripples throughout the province.
    - For example, a student moves back from AB, then moves to Germany and starts an organization, etc., do these ripples happen? SSHRC recognizes that long-term impacts of the research and societal change are a result of the research. Engagement activities are also one way to measure.

- National and international recognition
  - You cannot be Folklorist and not want to work at MUN. I met a very famous person in folklore at a conference and told them I got a job in Folklore at MUN and he said “WOW! Good for you!” This is an indicator of MUN’s success.
  - Russian got the same response. MUN sounded interesting and like a mythical place, and they wikipediaed it.

9.6.5 Factors which affect our research success

- Small university
  - The perception of Memorial; German is a small department with no PhD students.
  - We are a place where there aren’t as many options in terms of smaller colleges or trade schools, so we get everybody, and a lot of students are coming to us when
maybe they should be in community college or trade school. If students experience problems we can’t tell them to go elsewhere; there is only us.

- We have a special mandate to serve the people of the province and this is reflected in our entrance requirements, which could affect our rankings. The diverse student body results in a lot more work.
- My courses tend to have U-shaped distribution of marks which makes teaching-research challenging.

**Teaching Loads**
- If I work at UofT I’d have more time allocated to research, but here teaching is more important. If I get a SSHRC, who would teach my courses?
- Do we have one of the heaviest teaching loads I wonder? Some of my other colleagues in other places are teaching 4 instead of 5 courses per year.
- With time there has been a shift in terms of funding for faculty or departments that comes down to the number of students in classes, and if we have to teach big numbers we have less time to do other things. I’m teaching twice the number of students as when I started; when I started I had SSHRC grants and now I don’t have time.
  - To get 60 students in a course that is writing-intensive is not helpful for us and not helpful for students. It’s helpful for the budget.
- Is time a way to gauge our success in research? Anything we do detracts from something else. A successful researcher is one that can balance heavy teaching, administrative, and research loads, or not balance it by getting out of the teaching.

**Poor fit with funding agencies**
- SSHRC has no German studies focus, so the message is that I shouldn’t apply there. We must apply to RDC when we start, but it has no relevance. Sometimes it feels like I’m squeezing what we do into something that doesn’t quite fit. But the same can be said for colleagues at other institutions as well.

**January 15, 2013 Capturing Research Success (Anthropology, Sociology, Economics, Political Science)**

**What we value**

**Time**
- We value the time to do our work and we feel we don’t have enough. Why don’t we have enough?

**Congeniality**
- Valuing the ability to work alone and in teams (congeniality), which is especially popular in grant applications these days.

**Integrity**
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- Prof X had a major impact that most people don’t know about because he doesn’t toot his own horn, but even beyond publications he has a lifetime of commitment, core values, and integrity. Maybe we should say that that is something we value.

**Beauty**

- We contribute clarity and beauty and hopefully cultivate in our students and others an appreciation of these things. That’s the old “what do the Arts do for humanity” kind of argument, but in most respects most of us carry that core belief, and we try to capture that in our writing and communicate that as a valuable thing to provide
  - C. Wright Mills and Peter Berger talk about these things
- Find it difficult to say in heads meetings that this particular person hasn’t published much, but everything this person has written is a jewel, it has a quality to it that is beyond most of the standard things that we read.
  - Why would they be a jewel? The beautiful writing, and because it’s so unusual. In academic writing there’s a lot of joyless prose and we don’t get points for writing beautifully.
- The Arts communicate and are very good in critical thinking, and enable students to write eloquent memos when they get into their jobs. Saying that is kind of like saying you learn to play the violin so that you’ll be more dexterous at the keyboard when you get your job. When you take these measures of what is important in the Arts you’re always going to be judged. The impact of this is why would you study medieval history to gain critical thinking – why wouldn’t you take critical thinking classes? It’s kind of a no-win game.
- Reinforces our discussion about a need for a holistic approach to measurement. Beauty could be a good one. It’s something you can’t measure but everybody recognizes.

9.7.2  What makes Arts different / special

- **Stories may be more appropriate than performance indicators**
  - There are intangible things that you cannot capture with any measure of success. Are measures a proper way? Are stories a better way? I’m worried that we’re falling into a trap, whether we use measures or stories.

- **Graduate students do not benefit the PI’s CV**
  - We need to communicate the reality that supervising PhD and Masters students in Arts is different, because you don’t get the pay-off in terms of publications. In Science, grad students benefit the PI’s CV, whereas for us it’s time away from our work. When someone contacts you to be your student, you have to think how much time it will take and how it will affect your research. It’s not seen as an asset, but as a drain.

- **Arts research is not costly**
  - However “unfunded” research is not unfunded because part of our salary supports research activities.
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- Getting the information and developing the ideas for our proposal often takes time.

- **The teaching-research nexus**
  - Or even a service-teaching-research nexus. I think this is something you really can’t capture: the way these different components feed into each other, like the way teaching and research feeds into each other. Sometimes they’re seen as antagonists; in the agreement teaching is a punishment for not doing research. But we do value teaching that is research informed; we think it’s great for the students and we think it’s great. That’s the stuff students seem to be most interested in. We can get into the gritty details and results.
  - Even developing a new course takes a lot of research. To get a new course on the books is a pretty major piece of research.
  - Seminar courses really blur the distinction between teaching and research; you can bring your research into the conversation.
  - You can do course-based research where your students go out and do surveys; for example, in field methods. Quite often publications come out about documenting previously undocumented languages as a result of field methods courses.
  - Prof X’s students do surveys (with department ethics approval) and student co-authored publications come out of that.

9.7.3 **Administrative concerns / recommendations**

- **Indicators could affect the choice of research topic**
  - Need to think of the effect of the indicators on what people do.
  - In the UK people started studying for the test, so instead of being driven intellectually they are driven by the next ROE, and lives of department are at stake. This is quite unhealthy and has modified research and the integration of research and teaching; you can’t compare how someone’s work integrates vs. feedback saying “wow that prof really makes me excited,” and universities are putting pressures on employees to do things that can be measured on those measurements.
    - Similar to high school students who feel they need to do volunteer work to get into university. It’s just another box, not driven by any impulse to care about “social justice”; they may not even know what social justice is. This is part of this bigger conversation.

- **Our success should be promoted to upper administration**
  - Currently, marketing and promotion dollars aren’t used to communicate what we do. The Arts faculty has a need to push information about our research and why it’s good to the upper administration. They will use what we give them, but they won’t try to get information themselves. We should be trying to feed them a story on stellar research projects every week. Could think of this as effectively telling our story as well.

- **National benchmarks may not be applicable/valid**
Appendix B  Capturing Research Success — Notes from Consultative Meetings

- Where are these national benchmarks obtained? Are they available in other disciplines? A thing that concerns us is that they are only using certain indexes, especially in an international research environment. Open sources, social sciences indexes, etc. No one seems to be aware of national criteria; they seem to be used but not formalized.

**We are heterogeneous and do not fit the strategic plan**

- Arts is heterogeneous, and can lie outside of the strategic research themes, which caused some participants to be worried; however, there have been no indications that research performance indicators will be used as an audit culture from above.
- The strategic plan has always seemed a bit backwards. To set the bounds of the discussion and then ask how we define ourselves within the bounds we set seems completely opposite. The idea that the president says that engagement is a key aspect of this university and then asks us what engagement is seems illogical to me. Instead of asking us where we are, we are framing these things within the bounds that somebody else has set, and where we go after that I don’t know. It is frustrating and distressing.
  - To continue the conversation, we must go with the fundamental assumptions they have and highlight the blind spots to tell them the other things they could talk about.
  - We need to hash out what is different or unique about the humanities and social sciences research and start from there, not with the categories that have been imposed, otherwise how do we start this conversation?

**Hire someone to compile the data that is already available**

- It seems that the P&T process captures many other pieces, such as failed grant applications. If Arts did data mining of everything in the P&T CVs and reports, we could make a report of the best research, and other things that didn’t go through, that show effort. This could be a full time job, making a roll up of the results, both quantitative and qualitative. Certainly that data is there but we don’t do a good job of advertising it outwards and upwards.
- Mining P&T files and grant applications gives a good idea of people’s research (the blurbs on why my research is so good, why you should fund this application, etc.) but there are privacy concerns. You’d have to get permission from faculty members to use these materials for this purpose.
- In the P&T process you do bean count to some extent; you look at the CV in as expert a manner as possible in terms of discipline, but it’s contextualized with the cover letter, unsuccessful grants, future projects and networks. It would be lovely to have someone compile this for the entire faculty. The stuff is there. It’s an enormous amount of work, but everyone elaborates on their own work in their P&T files. At least up to tenure all that information is there for the junior faculty.

**Track data more effectively**
Appendix B  Capturing Research Success — Notes from Consultative Meetings

- Last summer the VPA required a 4-year plan from all heads in Arts, and what struck me was that a number of the kinds of relatively simple measures that we were looking for weren’t being collected. It doesn’t seem like Arts has communicated, or CIAP knows, what sorts of measures are important for departments in the Arts. What are the important things to keep track of?
  - Now in our department we keep track of the grad students who come into our program and the ones that were turned down, particularly due to lack of supervisor, so that in our report we could say that we had to turn down these good students because we don’t have someone who specializes in families, for example.
  - One of the figures the Dean asked for were the number of students coming in from NL schools who majored in the Arts. We have no clear figure, only estimates. Could be because so many students don’t declare an Arts major until later in their careers.
  - Perhaps we should consider what kind of states would be helpful to promote and show the powers of be what we do, need, and produce.
  - The registrar’s office hasn’t tracked some of this info.

- With alumni effort we can now keep track of our graduates. Did they get jobs? Where did they go? Did they move onto professional degrees? These are supportive to the Arts. Several people in government have an arts degree.

- Engineers get an engineering job; in Arts you don’t get an Arts job, but you do get a job. There are stats out there that show you do benefit from the degree and it pays off, but it could take longer.

9.7.4 Potential Indicators

- **Should be holistic**
  - There’s a longitudinal wave when looking at performance of one colleague over the course of his or her career, and we can’t only rely on the quantitative indicators. Quite a few seem to be legit to me, but are incomplete. This is the point of holistic assessment.
  - In SSHRC applications they request data that look like performance indicators, but in the CV section they have “what’s your most important research contribution” where you get to explain why. Thinking of a mixed approach that has both indicators and qualitative stores.
  - Measuring someone over the course of their career instead of annually is important; people’s lives get complicated at certain times. Again the more holistic viewpoint of the entire career over a longer stretch of time.
  - Not privileging one activity over the other: service, teaching, research, publications are important, and they all feed into each other and improve our understanding of what we’re doing, but whatever we produce has to be holistic.
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- Another angle to the holistic approach could be paying more attention to the more innovative teaching stuff, like developing new courses that may be more interesting to students, or even courses that introduce students to a whole new body of knowledge.

**Funding**
- Money is not necessarily problematic; funding is a result of past performance. But it’s a problem if money is used by itself to determine the performance of different units.

**Quality scholarship**
- Current indicators seem to be measuring performance, not scholarship. Editors don’t have the ability to reject articles that are inferior because they have to fill up an increasing number of volumes per year, so impact factors are a false indicator of scholarship, but they come up as the only potential qualitative indicator of national benchmarks.
- Scholarship is not captured. Is there some way that we can ensure that the quality of scholarship can be measured side by side with the more quantitative assessments?
- Quality and success are two different things. I would like to say that a successful academic is one that produces quality research (for example, Prof X’s two books) but have to look at the intent of the research. We have strategic plan and there’s no denying that a measure of success is the number of students, articles, and books that faculty produce. Quality is a more difficult measure. We could put out a statement that success in arts research means quality.

**Output**
- These quantitative measures (number of articles, books, etc) are sort of seen as typical indicators, but maybe we could also add other numbers, such as how many people have seen your article, citation impact indicators, etc.

**Number of students**
- If the number of PhDs and MAs will be an indicator, then the declining amount of funds we get every year has to be addressed, and we have to think how we will take in more students and what that would mean in terms of teaching, etc.

**Impact / Change**
- Prof X, for example, has produced a total of two books and some articles in her lifetime, but the impact is phenomenal.
- In managing development programming, the qualitative / quantitative struggle was always a big one, and the qualitative piece always boiled down to capturing change: what changes, or potential changes, were a result of this project? Regardless of whether it’s a journal or a book, what changes will this cause? Is there a systematic way to identify that change?
  - I don’t think many people read our journal articles, but when we teach that’s when a lot of people get to hear what we’re thinking about. It’s a different way
of thinking about the world and the piece of the world, people get engaged; so
teaching is one way to cause change.

- Even if only 2 other researchers looking at your topic read your article and
change their thinking, that is change as well.

**Service**

- Service really does cut into time to do your own research; it enables other people’s
research but not necessarily your own.
- Hosting national conferences and doing manuscript reviews for journals was on the old
P&T CV; that’s time and service you’re doing but is a small line on your CV, and that’s
not currently captured. If you get a 60 page article and revise and resubmit it 3 times,
that’s a lot of work. Editorial work, departmental speaker series, talks hosted by
departments, organizing them, all this needs to be captured in there somehow.
- Would you think that some service is more valuable than others in terms of research
goals? Which is more valuable, being an editor of a journal or organizing your
department’s colloquia for a year? Organizing has some value too.
  - I am on the editorial boards of a journal and book series. Reviewing
manuscripts is an important task, and publishing people’s work and helping
them get it into book form is important, but what I think was of least value was
being the editor of the journal. We had to increase the number of volumes per
year, quality was going down, and success was measured by how many times
an article was clicked on, so the impact of the article itself wasn’t as important
as a provocative title. Outside of your own discipline, a journal article is
probably one of the least read things you will write.
  - IP rules are affecting what we do. Most journal articles aren’t accessible
to undergraduates, so publically funded academics aren’t producing
work that is available to students, and now we cannot copy book
chapters due to IP.
- Do you think editing a journal as opposed to editing a book would be different?
  - Editing a book involves more intellectual engagement: you make an
introduction, something new out of a bunch of separate chapters. Books are a
lot more work; you’re really engaging with the authors and helping them shape
their argument. In terms of a qualitative measure, far more work than editing
the journal. We value it, but how do we capture that?
  - Some of the things we value can’t be captured and measured, but can be
communicated.

**9.7.5 Factors which affect our research success**

- Lower enrollment
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- Enrolments have been down in Arts and up in the university, but this could be because nobody knows what Arts does; a lot of the subjects aren’t taught at high school levels. Need more exposure.

- **We are separated from our peers**
  - Having our department spread out on the other side of campus means that we don’t see our colleagues.

### 9.7.6 How we can improve research success in Arts

- **Reduce the teaching load**
  - We’re in competition with the other universities, but we’re in NL and our funding situation is different than any other university. In order to achieve higher performance we need a better research environment. Right now we need to teach 5 courses per year and other top universities only teach 4; we need more time for research.

- **Reduce redundant paperwork**
  - If we didn’t have to produce so much paperwork for bureaucracy, there would be more time for research. There’s been a lot of duplication. Also our admin staff has more reporting to do and therefore not as much time to support us.

- **Market ourselves to improve the perception of Arts**
  - We’re keeping quiet and it’s hard for students to feel the value of the degree when they see engineering students in the local paper.
  - If Arts faculty could brag about their research once a month it would be helpful, but there’s no time.
    - Here there is no direct incentive to brag about what you’re doing except maybe getting a merit pay bumper. Is there something else to incentivize that?
  - If my colleagues wrote something, I might see it, but at other universities they’d put out a press release, arrange interviews, etc. If I publish a highly ranked article it just disappears as far as public is concerned. So maybe a more proactive communication strategy would communicate what the whole faculty is doing. There has to be more of a push; we can’t expect the faculty members themselves to do it.
  - If you want people to see your research you would publish it elsewhere and not in an academic journal.
    - This shows the mentality of Arts people. In the Gazette, you often see so and so from another faculty presented a paper at a conference. If staff is available you could say what is happening every day, so that you could have this scrolling display of what is happening. You could have an online form you fill out, and this could give a sense of movement and activity. We could talk about who was a speaker, who was interviewed, etc.
    - Just a thought to capture the diversity of what is happening every day. If we don’t hear anything we assume nothing is happening. Engineers have no desire to learn about Arts; we have to put it out there.
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- In the European context people are more out there. Every time I talk there are reporters, and reporters always cover the university talks. This shows the local value. But here there doesn’t seem to be as much public engagement. In Belfast if I wanted to write something for public audiences I could do it, but here there aren’t as many public venues and public talking.

9.8 March 4, 2013 Capturing Research Success (French & Spanish, German & Russian, English & Literature, M.Phil in Humanities)

9.8.1 Indicators

- Output
  - Type depends on the department; some are books, some are journal articles.
  - Journal articles can take up to 2 years to get out.
  - In French our vision is to produce as much as possible in the areas that we’re interested in.
    - If this is the case the indicators used to compare French departments at different institutions across Canada should be fine.
  - A universal list is not appropriate
    - This is not about producing a list to compare everyone to; the final report will acknowledge differences between departments and have both quantitative and qualitative indicators.

9.8.2 What makes Arts different / special

- We may not need grant money...
  - I don’t need grants if I am invited to a festival: they pay my way there, etc.
    - But this should be true of that field anywhere: why is MUN at the bottom of the tri-council list in the same fields?
    - It’s time that we need for research as opposed to money, and people don’t want to invest a lot of time into a grant when they could use the time on their research. We value research that doesn’t require external funding.

- ... but we could benefit from funding
  - Applying for a grant was a useful exercise; it made me think about how other disciplines use their money (eg, what you could get a student could do). I think we can learn from the social sciences on how we can use SSHRC money to hire students to do our reviews, etc, but perhaps we’re not as accustomed to collaboration or hiring PhD students.
  - In some cases I need dialogue to talk to other people in my area; I need money to travel to conferences. It’s very isolated here, so it’s crucial to travel to meet with people doing research that is similar to ours to advance our research and put MUN on the map. The amount we currently get barely helps.

- I don’t see myself as part of a corporation
About being competitive: it’s problematic, because I don’t see myself as working in a corporation. I see myself as working in a university for my students, for people in other places, so I hear that and I find it problematic when we place ourselves in that discourse of being competitive, which is the discourse of corporations.

**Connection between teaching and research**

- If I want to make an argument for myself that my teaching should be valued, then I can publish myself in the teaching discourse; otherwise how am I going to make the argument that my teaching is important if I’m not going to publish in it?
  - Eg. French developed a first year textbook that was researched
- I’m more interested in Europe than in Germany. When I think of putting up a new upper year course, I get an interdisciplinary topic in mind so I can offer it for more departments and get enough students. Our focus as an undergrad institution is driving our interdisciplinary.
- I can’t imagine teaching 4th year courses without drawing on research.
- Student commentary in graduate discussions affects faculty thinking more so than undergraduate commentary.
- When iPads first appeared, we worked with students and brought them into my class and a physics class, did qualitative research on it, some conference talks, and now we’re working on 2 things: an ongoing blog on technology in the classroom, and the physics professor and students are working on a journal article together.
- We wanted to do a play on social justices and uranium mining in Labrador and worked on it with students over the summer. Their feedback really directed how the play was written, and the play itself is my creative work and research, which was driven by student input, etc.
- I’ve worked with students after a poetry course to produce anthologies. After the cod moratorium we created an anthology of sea poems and used some of the money to create a scholarship for someone affected by the moratorium. The students had equal editorial say, and we had great discussion and battles regarding which poems would go in.
- I always learn something when I teach a class. Some of the previously mentioned activities were experiential learning, but even in more traditional classes I may have ideas that never occurred to me.

**Research creation**

- We have creative activity, and research is involved in any form of creation that you do. Research is a form of investigation. The fact that a lot of research needs to be done to write a poem may not be obvious to those outside the humanities. My book is a book of Cento, (a poetical work wholly composed of verses or passages taken from other authors; only disposed in a new form or order; [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cento_%28poetry%29](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cento_%28poetry%29)), and an investigation into syntax
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by reading massive amounts of poems. I’ve done more research for that book than any other single project I’ve worked on, including thesis.

- Not scholarly to say that what we do is “self-evident” – problem is that we’ve come to know our work so well that it seems simple, and what is self-evident to us is not self-evident to others.

- Some of the uniqueness of creative practices is the types of messages you can convey that you couldn’t say otherwise
  - There is some commentary you can state in editorial cartoons that you couldn’t state otherwise
  - Comics are a form of social commentary

- Someone who works in language is engaging in a creative act. The kinds of creation involved in poetry, fiction, and drama involve bringing together and reassembling patterns of language in entirely new ways that were not thought of before.

9.8.3 What we value

- Collaborating and integrating different fields of work
  - The assumption that comics studies is a sub-genre of literature for people who can’t read is 20 years out of date. We’re hoping to bring a comics studies convention / conference here and link it to engagement with community as both a celebration of comics research and a way of mobilizing our knowledge in slightly less traditional ways
    - English department has one of strongest research clusters in graphic narrative in the country.
    - Resurrecting a ballet from the 1920s from a composer celebrating a Crazy Cat comic strip, and thinking of involving the NL symphony orchestra. That connection between different fields of work is something people don’t know, and that’s the sort of connections that are exciting.
  - In French people’s research is usually conducted very independently of each other, and only in the past 2 or 3 years have we developed a research cluster on literature, and on a grant there would be different people applying for it.
  - In English partnerships are emerging as well.
  - People may not talk to each other if they don’t know what others are doing. Events like English department’s “Research in Motion” symposium, where everyone talks about the work they’re doing, leads to good conversation and discussion.

- The creative process – but this may not be valued at other levels of the university
  - Some of my research is creative, but I also write and research. I partly do this because I love it, but partly to fulfill the traditional requirement as well.
    - There is a gap in all the various awards that are set up. Even though we have scholarship, research, and creative activity in the collective agreement, in certain places creative activity doesn’t seem to show up, so is it really taken as equivalent?
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- You wonder if you’re valued in the same way as you would be if you were just publishing articles. Should you have to justify the work to such an extent? Should some of the things that we value to contextualize our work be common knowledge? Perhaps through this process we can make it common knowledge.
  - Dean’s award for outstanding research doesn’t have language about creative practice.

9.8.4 Things which negatively influence research capacity

- Provincial government may not value research
  - Undergraduate tuition is subsidized, but NL is one of the only provinces which doesn’t offer per head funding of graduate students.
  - The provincial Research Development Corporation - history of not funding Arts research proposals.
- We don’t have enough time
  - Need more secretaries
    - Have to type our own exams and papers, not enough time for research
  - Internal grant deadlines keep moving earlier every year, can’t apply because not enough time
  - I could write grant applications but it’s not the best use of my time. I could be writing, attending to students, engaging with the community, etc.
- MUN is an undergraduate-focused institution
  - Quite a lot of support for undergraduate education (students, class sizes, exam times, registrations, etc). Historical emphasis placed on teaching. Less support available for research.
  - Undergraduate students don’t have the language skills needed to help with our research. French is primarily undergrad and we fight for MA students for TAs.
- Insufficient secondary education of incoming students
  - Language is more difficult to teach because English grammar is no longer taught in schools, and students have to master English grammar before they can learn another language; they need to draw analogies between them. 30 years ago students were much more literate and got further by 4th year.
- Our values don’t align with tri-council expectations
  - One member wrote a grant focusing on research in Cuba and said she needed Spanish-speaking students, and they received feedback from the reviewer asking why they needed Spanish speaking students… very discouraging.

9.9 Departmental submissions

9.9.1 German and Russian

1. What do we value in our research, scholarship and creative practice?
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Historically, the Department of German and Russian was a very traditional language and literature department with a focus on strict periodization from the Medieval period to the 20th century. This was the old European model. Since the turn of the millennium the ground has shifted to a model that focuses on German and Russian Studies, which still includes the study of language and literature, but also covers film studies, gender studies, ethnic studies, transnational studies, memory studies, and literary translation. We embrace this new development for its broader concentration and its multi- and interdisciplinarity. The addition of a Major in Communications Studies in 2009-2010, which is administered by the Department of German and Russian, contributes significantly to this new focus as well. But we have not forgotten our first mission as transmitters of the German and Russian language in the largely monolingual environment of at least the island portion of our province either; we now see these as part of the bigger picture of communicating a historical/cultural record that includes a brilliant legacy of creativity in the arts and sciences in Germany and Russia as well as the state sanctioned cruelty of opposing totalitarian regimes (fascism and communism), which have profoundly altered our understanding of modernity and progress.

2. What research, scholarship, and creative process in our academic unit are special?

German, Russian and Communications Studies bring together scholars of language, literature, culture and communication and offer an important framework for students who need to understand the transatlantic community. In spite of globalization, or maybe because of it, learning the language and culture of another group of people in a different part of the world is more important than ever. Research and scholarship in the Department spans German and Russian language learning and pedagogy, literary analysis and translation, culture and film, gender and transnational issues, as well as theoretical issues related to communication of all kinds. All of these areas are pretty specific to our unit, in spite of some obvious links with the Departments of English and French and Spanish. Intercultural competence and proficiency in foreign languages in general remain essential for deeper international understanding, with German being of particular significance in bridging Eastern and Western Europe.

3. What are the best ways to describe and assess our research?

Historically, the Department of German and Russian defined itself very much as a teaching department. This is in part related to the history of the university itself and to its mission to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. It also has to do with the fact that we have a very small graduate program that includes the Masters degree but no Ph.D. Combined with the fact that we have to teach so many language courses, we do not necessarily teach in the areas we do research. This is still a problem today and distinguishes our unit from the larger departments in the Faculty of Arts. However, the combination of shifting our focus to area studies and to interdisciplinarity and the appointment of a new cohort of young and ambitious faculty members is also resulting in a culture that is increasingly research based. The dissemination of this research is still the most reliable metric of its success, and the current Collective Agreement adequately captures research under the headings
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of publications of all kinds and community outreach. Although one faculty member holds a SSHRC grant and two of our faculty members are in the process of applying for one, there is much unfunded research going on which leads to publications as well. It should be noted, though, that publications in our respective fields have a long gestation period, with articles sometimes only appearing in print two years after initial submission.

4. How can we most effectively gauge our success?

In addition to publications and reviews, including number of citations on Google Scholar, for example, our success can be gauged through our teaching. Our syllabi are available online and much of our research goes back into our teaching. Our increasingly disciplinary focus is also providing an impetus for creating more interdisciplinary courses by means of which we get out of our silos and open up our disciplines to a greater variety of students.

9.9.2 Political Science

1. What do we value in our research, scholarship, and creative practice? [Note: our values are not always reflected in the P&T process; another way to ask this question is “what should figure into P&T evaluations in our discipline?”]

There are specific ‘gold standard’ publications. While these vary across sub-fields in political science the main two are: books (both single/multiple-authored, and (co-)edited collections) and articles in refereed journals.

Even here there are grades of success. Certain publishers are better than others in specific subfields. Many publishers (eg: Oxford University Press) are considered excellent across all subfields. Journals vary too. At a bare minimum, articles in Web of Science journals are seen as carrying more weight than articles in non-Web of Science journals. On top of this there are lists (on both Web of Science and Google Scholar) that list the top disciplinary and sub-field journals. For a basic rule of thumb ASMs going up for tenure/associate professor should aim to have articles published in journals listed on the Web of Science. ASMs seeking promotion to full professor should also be targeting journals on the WoS and Google top 20 for their sub-field.

Chapters in edited books, articles in non-refereed journals, full-length ‘review articles’ and authorship of government reports, editorship of conference proceedings and other similar publications form a second tier of publication in political science. These can be used to supplement a research portfolio, but should not be the central part of it.

Book reviews and conference papers should not really be considered for research output counts in political science, although a good spread of national and international conference presentations should be part of an application for tenure.

Increasingly the attraction of external funding is becoming an indicator of research success. Political scientists are split on this issue. All would see research grant success as very positive, but the question
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of the extent that it should be weighted (in comparison to research ‘outputs’ like publications) is an issue of hot debate. Where you fall here often depends on your sub-field. For example: election studies often require external funding, and therefore rate its importance highly. Political theorists tend to make less use of external funding, and therefore see it as less vital.

While these are the top research indicators in our discipline, we do recognize that other disciplines will have different priorities and means of evaluating research excellence.

2. What research, scholarship, and creative practice in our Academic Unit is special? How is it special? Why is it special?

Political science indicators for research excellence are related to those in other social science and scientific fields. As a result I would not see any part of it as ‘special’ in the sense of not found elsewhere in the Faculty of Arts or in the Faculty of Science.

3. What are the best ways to describe and assess our research, scholarship, and creative practice?

In our Department, with a few exceptions, research is best measured in the forms outlined in the answer to question 1. These can often be measured effectively given the methods discussed in 4 below. A big question is how much weight we give to external funding, and whether external funding is compulsory or voluntary for research success in FoA.

4. How can we most effectively gauge our success? [Note: this question is relevant at the department and faculty level; we are not talking about gauging individual research success, but department and faculty-level success]

At a rudimentary level counting the numbers of monographs and refereed journal articles can be used as a rough guide. Counting articles in WoS and Google top 20 journals and books with international scholarly publishers refines this search.

Perhaps the basic issue when it comes to measuring research impact is the extent to which it is disseminated in the appropriate venues. In our Department this would mean mostly scholarly publishers and journals, although some public policy work has the clearest impact when it is published in government reports and documents. Similarly, in other Departments that might value performance the highest impact may be found in public venues or other media. Equally well, a researcher who works in local community development might see work disseminated through local outlets as a necessary supplement to their scholarly work in more traditional academic outlets.

Citations are also an important way of assessing our success. This can take several forms, of which the most accessible are: 1. Counting WoS citations gives a rough estimate of scholarly standing in disciplines and subfields that rely heavily on articles for transmitting knowledge. 2. Counting Google
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citations is a good way to bring other forms of research (books, book chapters, conference proceedings etc) into citation counts.

It is very common for academics to attack numeric calculations of research success, such as citation indices. While these attacks are true up to a point (at a counsel of perfection level we can never truly measure research success), this Luddite approach can unfairly denigrate several handy means for charting research success. WoS and Google citation indices, when combined with other forms of measurement (like journal impacts and appropriateness of the research outlets for the research undertaken) can be useful for comparing Departmental and Faculty research success. For example, if the Faculty’s number of WoS science citations per capita are increasing then this is a sign that our research is having a greater international impact. This kind of information can be used to argue at University level that the Faculty is fulfilling its goal of fostering scholarship. Similarly, if a Department increases its number of articles in the Google Scholar top 20 journals for its discipline this can be used as an argument for Departmental success in increasing the quality of its scholarship. These indices can be used in conjunction with other methods of measurement that could take into account other forms of research. While not revealing the whole picture, citation indices are valuable tools in charting FoA research success, especially as they give us a means to assess the extent to which our research is being read and used at an international level. We ignore them at our peril.

So, I am not completely happy with the comment made above in the instructions that “quantitative measures are insufficient indicators of research quality”. I think this comment misses the point, unless ‘insufficient’ is interpreted as meaning ‘necessary, but not sufficient.’

In sum, I would suggest a ‘mixed media’ form of assessment that would include citation indices, impact factors and lists of top disciplinary venues for research.

Specific recommendations:

• The FoA needs to recognize that many disciplines regard refereed journal articles as the key indicator of success;
• That monographs and journal articles are important means of assessing research output success across a range of disciplines;
• That citation indices, as well as WoS and Google lists of top journals, represent useful means for measuring research success;
• That a means for assessing the importance of external funding needs to be discussed by FoA.

9.9.3  History

The Department of History values academic freedom in our research, scholarship and creative practice. Such freedom safeguards the intellectual diversity and autonomy that are essential to research, scholarship and creative practice at a public university in a free and democratic society. Innovation and integrity in such research, scholarship and creative practice may only be realized by
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the preservation of its non-directed nature; good research, scholarship and creative practice are not commodities that may be regulated by production targets in a line-management setting.

History exists at the intersection of the humanities and social sciences. It is the consequent diversity of our research, scholarship and creative practice that makes our discipline unique and vital to our society. We respect and are committed to preserving this diversity by rejecting hierarchical assessments of these three components that define both our profession and us as historians. In our discipline, scholars communicate and disseminate the results of their research in numerous and diverse ways—not just through peer-reviewed journals. We write monographs, textbooks, popular histories, and edit or contribute to collections of essays or primary sources that appear in scholarly presses. Of course the dissemination of our research is not limited to various forms of print media. We also give oral presentations at conferences, workshops, and seminars and are often asked to deliver invited lectures to groups from our profession and the general public. In addition, department members use interactive digital media in their research. Developing websites, authoring blogs and contributing to media via podcasts and webcasts are part of our scholarship in and beyond outreach. Some of us collaborate actively with communities, non-profit groups, or government organizations in mentoring or advising roles related to public policy, heritage and culture. We do not believe that one form of dissemination is inherently more valuable than another but rather that each serves a valuable purpose. As historians, we are sensitive to how institutional and community priorities shift easily and constantly over time. We are also sensitive to the manner in which innovative forms of research, scholarship and creative practice often appear in reaction to management paradigms which are themselves specific in time.

A committed adherence to the collegial process is the best way to describe our research, scholarship, and creative practice. Collegiality is a nested practice that must begin with the individual scholar. Scholars should always be asked to describe their own work through the convention of the CV. A research committee of our peers chosen through the collegial process of the department should provide an analysis of trends in such descriptions. Finally, the aggregate results of such description may be integrated into a Faculty-level analysis by a committee of the Faculty.

The process for the assessment of our research, scholarship, and creative practice is governed by the Collective Agreement between Memorial University and MUNFA.

9.10 Individual submissions

•  (Lisa Rankin): Archaeology doesn't really have much more to contribute to the Capturing Research Success discussion apart from items that were raised at the meeting. However, I recall that there was much discussion about the role of engagement at this meeting - and that Dr. Gosine said that we could begin to use this for tenure and promotion evaluations. I doubt that this is the case until the Collective Agreement Rules which oversee this practice acknowledge the role of outreach/engagement. Furthermore, since that time I have also been told that someone could not be considered for a Memorial University Research Award because their work was thought to be
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community oriented and not academic enough. The University needs to decide what it values and implement this at every level. If they choose to acknowledge that engagement is a genuine part of "research" at MUN then they really need to acknowledge it in existing structures. I don't think that it is captured by creating "Engagement" awards. Alternately, if they decide that engagement is not part of the research process, then they need to stop bugging us about it.

• (Virginia Harger-Grinling): I believe we have lost sight of what a department of French should be. The foundation of our programmes should involve language. Literature and culture and this should be given to students with knowledge coming from the origins of each of these elements. Rather than spreading ourselves too thinly and introducing different elements which are removed from the concept of the language and its culture we should be providing those students with knowledge allowing them to thereafter judge more disparate elements and the originality and worth of those elements. If a student has no knowledge of the literature in its origins how can a student judge whether works read are original, imitations, or even examples of plagiarism. The same can be applied to the language. Interesting though it might be for a student of linguistics to study the variations in the language and the differences found in different regions of the world, no student can appreciate these differences without a knowledge first of all of the tenets of the so-called "standard" language. Most of our students have problems not only with French but also with their "mother" tongue. A programme in translation is another subject. Translation courses at the third and upper levels not only offer students the means to improve their ability in both languages but also allow them insight into the workings of the different cultures. They learn to appreciate how different cultures view the world and how this is reflected in the language used. In the same way comparative literature offers students the possibility to gain insight into worlds they would not otherwise know but it is particularly the student of translation who appreciates literature in translation and the problems such work poses for the translator and for any student of literature and language.

• (Neil Bishop): Virginia's warning about spreading ourselves too thinly might seem to be contradicted by the emphasis the end of her e-mail places on comparative literature. That is not so, provided we understand comparative literature as focusing on non-metropolitan French-language literatures and their relations (of similarity and difference, even revolt) with the literature of France. Were one to speak of comparative cinema or comparative culture, similar remarks would apply. Virginia correctly argues that we should emphasize standard French as the variety of French we teach; similarly, we should ensure that the bulk of our literature, cinema and culture courses bear upon the two major French-speaking cultures that need concern us-- those of France and Quebec.

• (Virginia Harger-Grinling): re: the application of interpretation and translation to research. Whenever we are involved with simultaneous interpretation we are obliged to spend several days or perhaps weeks studying and absorbing new vocabularies. To give you an example: I just received a 300 page lexicon from the Ontario dept of Justice to assist us in three days of interpretation in June. I remember a similar document from the air traffic controllers and another
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re: dams and terrorism. Such a discipline requires a constant up-dating of vocabulary in many different areas - health, law, public relations, politics, media just to mention a few of them. As a result we are far more cognizant of neologisms, differences in the cultural context (Quebec, France for example) and of course far more adept at changing rapidly from one language to the other than perhaps those teachers of language who have not perfected such skills. As a result my students, who definitely appreciate my teaching them translation courses, learn a great deal of what is applicable to the modern world and many of them go on to do graduate studies in translation at other universities - sadly as up until now we have no real translation programme at MUN.

• (Mary Dalton): provided a list of “Reflections of accomplishment in the field of creative writing (poetry)”, which will be found in the list of potential indicators in the draft final report from Arts.

9.11 People who attended the consultative sessions

• Note: The list of attendees for the December 13, 2013 meeting was incomplete. Please feel free to email cdyck@mun.ca, in order to amend the list.
• In alphabetical order: Tana Allan (Classics), Willow Anderson (German and Russian), Myriam Anderson (French and Spanish), Philippe Basabose (French and Spanish), Sonja Boon (Gender Studies), Valerie Burton (History), Phil Branigan (Linguistics), Alec Brookes (German and Russian), John Buffinga (German and Russian), Sean Cadigan (History), August Carbonella (Anthropology), Marica Cassis (History), Mark Cumming (English), Mary Dalton (English), Pat Dold (Religious Studies), Jennifer Dyer (M.Phil), Don Gamble (French and Spanish), Barry Gaulton (Archaeology), Anne Graham (French and Spanish), Vicki Hallett, Phil Hiscock (Folklore), Lisa Kaida (Sociology), Abdie Kazemipur (Sociology), Sarah Knee (Linguistics), Lianne Leddy (History), Josh Lepawsky (Geography), Mariya Lesiv (Folklore), Andrew Loman (English), Denise Lynde (English), Sara MacKenzie (Linguistics), Marguerite Mackenzie (Linguistics), Charles Mather (Geography), Craig Maynes (Classics), Maria Mayr (German and Russian), Sean McGrath (Philosophy), Seamus O’Neill (Philosophy), Rob Ormsby (English), Kim Parker (Religious Studies), Gerald Pocius (Folklore), Suma Rajiva (Philosophy), Lisa Rankin (Archaeology), Sharon Roseman (Anthropology), Behak Rueentan (Linguistics), Maureen Schneides (French and Spanish / Linguistics), Pearl Sedziafa, Kathryn Simonsen (Classics), Jamie Skidmore (English), Karen Stanbridge (Sociology), Robert Sweeney (History), Arthur Sullivan (Philosophy), Liam Swiss (Sociology), Mark Tate (Anthropology), Anne Thareau (French and Spanish), Cory Thorne (Folklore), Diane Tye (Folklore), Donna Walsh (English), Jeff Webb (History), Patti Wells (Geography), Robin Whitaker (Anthropology).