Here are the revisions that I would like your committee to consider, together with my rationales for them.

First, I'll point out some punctuation and grammar corrections that you can silently make in the draft (maybe you've already been alerted to these by others). On p. 2, third paragraph under "Research," second line: "discipline-specific" should be hyphenated. On p. 2, under "Teaching," first bullet: "for-credit" should be hyphenated. On p. 3, under "Extension," second to last line: "free-choice" should be hyphenated. In the next sentence "ongoing" should NOT be hyphenated. On p. 4, the first two bullets under "General Characteristics of This Group" (caps) could be revised for the sake of parallel construction:

   The work is specific to the discipline for which . . .
   The work requires . . .

On p. 4, the bullets at the bottom, the last bullet should begin with "work" with a lower-case "w." On p. 5, the second paragraph under "Service," the end of the second line needs a participle: perhaps "and to advancing their . . ." On p. 5, final paragraph under "Service," the last line should have plurals: "the extent that they contribute to . . ."

I also offer this for your committee's consideration: at the end of the third paragraph under Research on page 2, do you want to add the sentence: "Research assignments may entail an expectation of securing external funding"? This is not an issue for CLA, but from the outside it has long seemed to me that getting grants is more an aspect of the research assignment than of the scholarship that results from the research.

Here now are my three proposals:

1. This one seems to me uncontroversial, simply a matter of presenting ourselves as a university committed first and foremost to teaching students. Under "Faculty Representatives" on p. 2, in the opening paragraph I suggest the first category be changed from "assigned duties" to "teaching and other assigned duties." The second sentence would then have to read: "The most commonly assigned duties, in addition to teaching, include a) research, b) advising, and c) extension . . ." (deleting "teaching" from b). The next section head would then be changed to "Teaching and Other Assigned Duties." I would further suggest that the discussion of "Teaching" come first, followed by Research."
My rationale here is simple and obvious: to present ourselves and to our publics as a university that sees teaching in all of its dimensions as our primary mission.

2. This and the next one are apparently more controversial. In the section on "Research" (p. 2), I suggest that the first paragraph be deleted.

Here, I need to justify my suggestion. You stated at the meeting today that clarity must sometimes yield to flexibility. I agree with the principle, but I do not see its application here. "Research" is an assigned duty. It's what we do in laboratories, libraries, archives, field stations, our own offices, etc. "Scholarship" is the books, articles, published reports, etc. that derive from the "research" that we do. "Scholarly activity" is the more ambiguous term. We have institutionally assigned it a meaning equivalent to "scholarship," when in fact it can describe most of what we do in teaching, research, and even service.

I think that it is important to retain the clarity of "research," if only for the sake of position descriptions, which now emphatically must reflect allocation of workload. A position description in the English Department, for example, will likely assign 50% to teaching, 40% to research, and 10% to service, as the distribution of the faculty member's time commitments (calibrated on a mythical 40-hour work week). The position description should add that, for promotion and tenure, the faculty member will be evaluated on teaching (and/or other assigned duties), scholarship, and service, roughly in the same proportions—that is, with teaching and scholarship of primary importance and service secondary. Note that calling the workload distribution 50% teaching, 40% scholarship, and 10% service would be mixing allocations of time (for teaching and service) with the relative importance of a product (the scholarship). If we want position descriptions to be tied specifically to workload, we want to use the term "research" (an activity) rather than "scholarship" (a product). And our P&T Guidelines should maintain that clear distinction.

From your comments in the Senate, I take it that the problem you are trying to address lies in Extension appointments for faculty who do a lot of research that does not eventuate in scholarship, so the desire is to call the research scholarship in itself (perhaps using that ambiguous term "scholarly activity"). By calling research scholarship when in fact it is not scholarship solves a problem for one unit at the expense of the clarity (and thus the clear thinking) in the guidelines that govern the entire university. I offer two alternatives for Extension faculty. Have the position descriptions of these faculty reflect actual workload: e.g. 30% teaching, 60% research, 10% service (or whatever), then also state the specific expectations for scholarship apart from this distribution of time commitments. If that is a problem (because scholarship, say would be weighted only 30% while the assignment is 60% research), then employ that ambiguous term "scholarly activity." That is: 30% teaching, 30% research, 30% scholarly activity, 10% service. Such position descriptions would be different from those of regular faculty, but they would not force a distortion of the P&T Guidelines governing all of the faculty for the sake of this one anomalous group.
3. This one is also apparently controversial. In the section on "Service" (p. 5), in the third paragraph, I suggest moving the first sentence to the end of the previous paragraph (so as to acknowledge professional service after the statement about institutional service), then delete the rest of the paragraph.

The rationale, obviously, is to remove the ambiguity and confusion of service sometimes counting as service, sometimes counting as scholarship (not "scholarly activity," which describes most of what we do). I heard that the motive for doing this was concern over candidates for promotion to full professor who had done no institutional service but lots of professional service (on editorial boards, panels, etc.). This problem is now addressed in the revised criteria for promotion to associate and promotion to full, in the language about an "appropriate balance" between institutional and professional service. (You could even add a sentence--"All faculty must perform institutional service appropriate to their rank"—or something of the sort, if you are worried that this is not worded strongly enough).

The danger in the paragraph I propose deleting is in the potential unintended consequences of the statement that "service duties that draw upon their professional expertise and /or are relevant to their assignment" may count as scholarship. The context for this statement is a specific one regarding professional organizations. But the statement itself could be construed to apply more broadly. I offered one example in the Senate today that was apparently not persuasive to you. Here's another. Suppose we have an expert in assessment who develops a model for assessment in one of our departments, that is then adopted widely throughout the campus and picked up by other universities (thus "validated by peers" and "disseminated"). This activity should remain "service" until the assessment expert writes an article about it that is published in a peer-reviewed journal. Then it's "scholarship." If you want to argue that it should already count as scholarship, based on its validation and dissemination, you open up a huge Pandora's Box, in which all kinds of service can be claimed to be "scholarship" (perhaps when there are merit raises for a period when someone produced no scholarship but wants to claim that service on X or Y committee or task force was, in fact, scholarship). How (and if) the university values faculty service is an important issue, but it cannot be solved by calling service "scholarship" because we know we value scholarship. This is not the intent of the paragraph, but it could be the consequence.

If after consider my rationales, your committee declines to make the proposed revisions, I would appreciate your letting me know. If you can explain to me why the committee rejected them, in a way that is convincing to me, I'll drop them. If the explanation is not convincing, I'll offer these as amendments for the Senate to vote up or down. Either way, knowing ahead of time would be good for the Senate. If the members will have to consider my amendments, it would expedite the discussion if I submitted them before the meeting.

Thanks,

Michael