**Committee on Faculty Affairs Minutes**

**December 12, 2012**

Present: D. Hunt, B. McMahan, C. Alves, V. Tucci, S. Carroll, J. Stauff, J. Ruscio, M. Benoit, Kerri Tillet (for Gregory Pogue)

1. Review of Disciplinary Standards for Scholarship and Creative Work in the Department of Communication Studies

Many of the narrative issues have been addressed. There is evidence in the document of Alignment with Key Institutional Documents and Values. The only exception is that no reference is made to the College Promotion and Tenure Document.

Other elements of the proposed standards require further revision. Earlier comments from CFA included the following:

*Elements which have been included in the document but should be removed:* In regard to B1, elements listed on pp. 2-3 (b,c,g) are considered teaching (see page 29-30 of the Promotions document). Elements listed on p. 5 (#7-9) are considered service to the profession rather than scholarship (see page 31 and page 49 of the Promotions Document).

The proposed standards continue to include as scholarly or creative work items that are considered service to the profession rather than scholarship. These include: (p. 2) numbers 14, 17, 21, 22, and (p. 3) numbers 23, 24, 26, 29 and 30.

The standards applying to faculty working in the creative arena of Radio, Television, and Film within the Department of Communication Studies appear less rigorous than the standards that have been approved and have been very similar across departments college-wide. In all of the possible scenarios, many of the items that would be considered as meeting the requirements include those listed above, which are service to the profession, not scholarship. The document needs to do a better job of clarifying why there is such a reduced number of items required for tenure and for promotion to each rank.

Likewise, the standards that apply to faculty conducting traditional scholarship appear to be far more rigorous for tenure and for promotion to each rank than the standards that have been approved and have been very similar across departments, especially in the context of our short tenure clock. For example, for tenure, three to five significant publications are required, in addition to 2 to 4 additional items. The document should clarify the standards for publication in the relevant fields generally, including, for example, average length of time from submission to acceptance for well-regarded journals, and other criteria that might help someone not in the field understand how it works.

The scenarios on pages 7 to 9 need to be spelled out in prose. The purpose of the standards is to provide clear guidance to both candidates for promotion and tenure, and the CPC. The format of the scenarios is difficult to follow.

CFA comments on the proposed standards will be sent by Dave to the Provost. CFA will recommend further revision, as detailed above, and further review by CFA once revisions have been submitted.

2. It was agreed that the next CFA meeting will be held on the 4th Wednesday of January, since most members will not be available the second Wednesday.

Respectfully submitted,

Regina Morin