

## PROPOSED CECI PERSONNEL STANDARDS REVISIONS AND RATIONALE

---

The CECI Personnel Committee would like to thank our colleagues for their thoughtful suggestions and recommendations for revisions to the CECI personnel standards. The committee has reflected on your feedback throughout this process, and has given additional consideration to the feedback received at Forums in late March.

Throughout our deliberations, the committee has worked intentionally to support and protect junior faculty. A history of vague and subjective personnel standards across the university has left junior faculty vulnerable, as standards may be interpreted differently across and even within Units. While we understand that “loose” standards may afford more flexibility, they do not offer clear direction (nor protection, in the event of an unfavorable personnel decision) to junior faculty. Our hope with the CECI Personnel Standards Chart is that it will provide clear direction to candidates AND provide a scaffold of support in the event of an unfavorable decision.

In addition, the committee has already begun work on a Personnel Standards Narrative which will buttress the chart (this will be similar in format to both former-CCPS and former-COE personnel standards documents).

From the Forums held at the end of March, as well as from recommendations from individual Units and faculty, the committee identified (4) areas for consideration that merited additional deliberation. Please see each of these, the changes (if any) made by the committee, as well as our rationale, below.

**We present this document, as well as the revised Proposed CECI Personnel Standards Chart (in a separate document), for your review.** There were no substantial comments on either the Teaching or Service Standards Charts, and so those are not discussed here, and appear unedited in the Proposed CECI Personnel Standards Chart. *Proposed Scholarship Standards are included first in the Final Proposed CECI Personnel Standards Chart only for accessibility purposes; areas are not listed in order of significance.*

### **Area for Consideration #1: Revise “at least” Language**

**Changes Made:** Removed the “at least” language throughout the entire document (see track-changes in Revised Scholarship Standards Chart)

**Rationale:** The committee agreed with the recommendation, and found it to be consistent with University language. We have adjusted the language in the proposed CECI Standards Charts to reflect this change (see track-changes in Revised Scholarship Standards Chart).

## Area for Consideration #2: Conference Requirement

**Changes Made:** Added “as defined by Unit” throughout the entire document (see track-changes in Revised Scholarship Standards Chart). Discussed and will be including a notation (in the Personnel Standards Narrative document) that the candidate need not be physically or virtually present for the ‘scholarly presentation’ to “count” - if the name of the candidate is documented on the conference presentation, it is sufficient (unless otherwise specified by the Unit).

Example of language for the Personnel Standards Narrative document: *“Candidates must indicate their role in the work presented and document their inclusion on the presentation, but are not required to be physically or virtually present at the conference (unless otherwise specified by the Unit)”*

While the former-COE did require candidates to indicate if they were not “present” for the presentation, neither college nor the University lists physical/virtual presence as a requirement.

**Rationale:** This is one area in which the committee has deliberated extensively over the past several months. The former-COE required (2) peer-reviewed conference presentations for Tenure, and (3) peer-reviewed conference presentations for promotion to full Professor. On the other hand, the former-CCPS did not specify a number of required conference presentations. The committee agreed that conferences offer an opportunity for dissemination, as required by the University, and are a relatively common practice across all CECI Units.

The committee:

- reduced the original recommended requirement of (2) conference presentations down to (1) in both the Tenure and Promotion to Full categories (following feedback in February); and following much additional discussion,
- felt it reasonable to maintain the requirement for (1) conference presentation within Tenure, as well as (1) within Promotion to full Professor personnel decision periods.

The committee is hopeful that the added flexibility (see “Changes Made” above) provides additional opportunity for candidates, while still encouraging varied dissemination of their expertise.

## Area for Consideration #3:

### Lower “count” of expected scholarship to not exceed previous requirements

**Changes Made:** After much debate, the committee decided not to alter the recommended standards.

**Rationale:** While the committee recognizes that from a “counting” standpoint, the standards may appear to be more strenuous (e.g., “5 items” rather than “4 items” to complete), we have worked

deliberately to lessen stringency (primarily from the former-COE) while maintaining flexibility (primarily for the former-CCPS).

For example:

- The proposed recommended standard for Tenure in CECI = 1 conference presentation + 1 peer-reviewed article + 1 other scholarly publication + 2 scholarly activities (5 items)
- The former-COE had a lower “count” (2 peer-reviewed conference presentations + 2 peer-reviewed articles = 4 items) but more strict standards.
- The former-CCPS standards (1 peer-reviewed article + 3 scholarly contributions = 4 items) had the same “count” as the former-COE, but more flexibility.

We feel the proposed standards marry the expectations of both colleges, while maintaining both reasonable flexibility and rigor.

#### **Area for Consideration #4:**

#### **Expand list of “Scholarly Activities” to include the full University List**

**Changes Made:** The committee elected to add (2) items to the sample list of Scholarly Activities. The following items have been added to the list of examples of Scholarly Engagement:

- Photography exhibits that are meaningful within the candidate’s discipline
- Documentary/film that is meaningful within the candidate’s discipline

**Rationale:** The committee was asked to include the full list of [‘Scholarly or Creative Activity’](#) provided by the University to provide maximum flexibility. Following much discussion (which began back in November, 2021, and has continued over the last several months) the committee once again felt it was not appropriate to do so, for the following reasons:

1. There are several items on the University list that the committee does not feel represent completed scholarship, are not generally relevant to expertise in our disciplines, or are too subjective for meaningful review.

Examples include:

- “Conducting a professional ensemble”
- “Book, software, or website reviews”
- “Professionally relevant blog with proof of substantial readership”
- “Sharing data”
- “Literature Review”
- “Establishing a lab for a research project”

Rather than begin with the full list and then have to include exceptions, the committee opted to start instead with a narrowed list of the most common examples of activities utilized within the former-CCPS and former-COE, and then include the following caveat (in order to open up additional items that may not be on the list):

Note: This list is adapted from that which is provided by the university and represents the scholarly activities considered to be most appropriate and applicable to faculty in the College of Education and Community Innovation. **The list is not exhaustive, and items are not ranked by level of significance. Faculty have the opportunity to include additional scholarly activities which are not listed here;** explanations as to how their activity meets scholarship expectations must be included within the candidate narrative. Please consult unit level standards, and the definitions and guidelines posted to section 3.01 of the Faculty Handbook, for further guidance.  
*[Note: This caveat appears on the original Scholarship Standards Chart]*

We felt this method would provide more clear guidance to incoming and junior faculty. Furthermore, as required by [SG 3.01.E.1](#), “The university expects a faculty member to establish a record of scholarly or creative endeavor that is meaningful within the scholar's discipline.” We felt the full university list is drafted broadly to include the full range of scholarly work that faculty members may engage in during their employment; it was not meant to be a list of scholarly products to demonstrate one's readiness for tenure or promotion. Treating it as such may be confusing and/or disingenuous for incoming and junior faculty.

2. Additionally, members of the FPPC have supported the point above, and specifically stated that the list was not created to apply to all colleges and Units; it was crafted to be intentionally broad in order to encompass all disciplines across the University.

**It is with these changes and stated rationale that we submit for consideration our Recommended Personnel Standards (Charts) for the College of Education and Community Innovation.**

**Respectfully Submitted,**

**The CECI Personnel Committee**

*David Bair, Jacquelynn Doyon-Martin, Rick Geisel, Erica Hamilton, Priscilla Kimboko, Sherie Klee, Cray Mulder, Scott Rood, Cindi Smith, and Melissa Villarreal.*